WARNING: NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR OTHERWISE, WITHOUT EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE PUBLISHER. PERMISSION TO VIEW THIS DOCUMENT IS GRANTED ONLY TO CURRENTLY ACTIVE SUBSCRIBERS TO *THE AUGUST REVIEW*.

TRILATERALS OVER WASHINGTON II

ANTONY C. SUTTON
PATRICK M. WOOD

PUBLISHED BY
THE AUGUST CORPORATION

The August Corporation

THE AUGUST CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 1309
RATHDRUM, ID 83858

Copyright @ 1981 ANTONY C. SUTTON
PATRICK M. WOOD

All rights reserved

1st Printing – March 1981

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 78-78277
International Standard Book Number 0-933482-02-7

Published in the United States by
THE AUGUST CORPORATION

The August Corporation

Merchants have no country. The mere spot they stand on does not constitute so strong an attachment as that from which they draw their gains.

Thomas Jefferson
Letter to Horatio G. Spafford
[March 17, 1814]

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
HUMANISM: THE GLOBAL IDEOLOGY 5
CORLISS LAMONT AND THE MORGAN FINANCIAL GROUP 8
THE ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES 8
PUBLIC FINANCING OF ASPEN 10
SUMMARY OF ASPEN INSTITUTE FUNDING 11
THE ASPEN EXECUTIVE SEMINAR PROGRAM 11
THE FUND FOR GOVERNANCE 12
GLOBAL SCHOOLING: THE RE-EDUCATION OF AMERICA 15
A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP 16
AN ACTION PLAN IS UNDERWAY 18
CENTRALIZED, GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED EDUCATION REQUIRED 19
THE PLAN IS UNDERWAY 19
PARENTS NEED TO BE EDUCATED ALSO 21
HOW GLOBAL EDUCATION IS BEING FINANCED 23
MASS MEDIA AND THE MARKLE FOUNDATION 24
TRANSCENDING POLITICAL SYSTEMS: CAPITALISTS VS. MARXISTS 29
THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION (1917) 30
THE EARLY YEARS OF SOVIET RUSSIA 30
THE FIRST FIVE YEAR PLANS (1930-45) 32
WORLD WAR II 32
POST WORLD WAR II 32
KISSINGER AND SOVIET MILITARY BUILD UP 34
THE TRILATERAL VIEW OF COMMUNISM 36
ESTABLISHMENT COVER UP 36
DAVID ROCKEFELLER AND SOVIET MILITARY POWER 37
ELITIST FRIENDS OF TRILATERALISM 41
THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS 41
THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION 42
THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF THE UNITED STATES 43
THE COMMISSION ON CRITICAL CHOICES FOR AMERICANS 45
ELITIST CONTROL OF U.S. POLICY MAKING 47
QUADRUPLE HATS 48
TRIPLE HATS 49
DOUBLE HATS 50
TRILATERAL FOREIGN POLICY AND HUMAN RIGHTS: THE CASE OF COMMUNIST CHINA 53
THE U.S. - COMMUNIST CHINA AGREEMENT 54
THE HISTORICAL PARALLEL 56
THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK 58
THE NEW CHINA POLICY IS A TRILATERAL POLICY 59
JAPANESE TRILATERALS AND CHINA 60

THE CASE OF THE PANAMA CANAL 62
TRILATERAL ASSUALT ON HUMAN RIGHTS..... 63
PROPERTY RIGHTS SUBORDINATED 64
RUSSIAN CHRISTIANS AND THE US EMBASSY IN MOSCOW 64
IDI AMIN AND TRILATERALISM..... 68
RELEVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS 69
SLAVES IN COLOMBIA..... 70
TRILATERALS VS. A FREE AMERICA 72
THE PACIFIC BASIN PHENOMENON 77
BACKWARD AND FORWARD 83
THE ORIGINS OF GLOBALISM..... 83
ATTEMPT #1: THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS 84
ATTEMPT #2: THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS 85
ATTEMPT #3: TRILATERALISM 87
THE 1980's PROJECT 88
TRILATERAL MONEY MANAGEMENT 89
THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS..... 90
WILL THE REAL REAGAN PLEASE STAND UP?..... 92
TRILATERALISM IN EUROPE..... 95
TRILATERALISM AND "ONE EUROPE" 96
THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY 97
BELGIUM..... 97
DENMARK..... 98
EIRE (IRELAND) 98
FRANCE 99
WEST GERMANY 100
ITALY 100
LUXEMBOURG..... 101
NETHERLANDS 101
UNITED KINGDOM..... 101
HOW EUROPE SEES THE POLITICAL PROCESS 102
EUROPEAN BLOCKAGES TO INFORMATION..... 103
ASPEN INSTITUTE BERLIN..... 103
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS 107

PREFACE

"We have councils of Vocations, Councils of Eugenics, every possible kind of Council, including a World Council - and if these do not as yet hold total power over us, is it from lack of intention?

"Some might think - though I don't - that nine years ago there was some excuse for men not to see the direction in which the world was going. Today, the evidence is so blatant that no excuse can be claimed by anyone any longer. Those who refuse to see it now are neither blind nor innocent."

Author's Foreword, *Anthem*
Ayn Rand, 1946

In the two years since Volume I of *Trilaterals Over Washington,* the "sleeping giant" has barely awakened to yawn before going back to sleep. While then hardly anybody in the U.S. had heard of the Trilateral Commission, now somewhere around 10 per cent are aware of its existence.

In spite of this increased awareness, as this Volume II will demonstrate, little has been done to curtail or forestall the rise of Trilateralism.

The authors' view of Trilateralism and of many Trilateral Commission members has "mellowed" considerably since Volume I was written. More research, many personal contacts with members of the Commission and extensive travel have all contributed to this change.

A certain percentage of members are indeed sincere in their quest for Tri1atera1ism, albeit sincerely wrong (in the authors' estimation). Others are not so innocent, and are quietly deceptive and misleading about their motives in creating a New Economic World Order.

We find that the Trilateral Commission, per se, is not attempting to create a world government - *that* is nonchalantly left to other forums and organizations, in which one finds many individual Trilateral Commissioners, but not the Trilateral Commission itself.

The Commission is dedicated to creating a *New Economic World Order* as opposed to a Political World Order. They cannot be directly

or fairly criticized for the latter. Indirectly, of course, there are many close connections.

Neither is the Trilateral Commission a "conspiracy." The authors have been able to secure information about the Commission without undue hardship - this book proves it. The authors do not pass judgment on the legality of any specific act of this alleged "conspiracy"; that should be left for a court or a Congressional investigation.

In short, in order to properly expose the details and plans of Tri1ateralism it is not necessary or desirable to argue over what one *doesn't* know. The Trilateral elite is operating in full daylight, but few are willing to say "Halt!"

Meanwhile, America continues to live in a state of fantasy, unable to discern reality amidst a myriad of surrealistic stimuli. America continues to be literally brainwashed by the electronic media, but not that it was all intended that way - to a large extent, Americans are getting exactly what they asked for!

Is America calming down to the serious business of saving the world from itself by embracing atheistic Humanism? Hardly. Americans spend more than $2.3 billion per year on tranquilizers. Of the $3.34 billion per year on the thirteen most popular medications sold, eighteen percent ($600 million) is for the tranquilizer *Valium.* $1.2 billion (another 36 per cent) goes for ulcer and high blood pressure medicine.

Psychiatrists and psychologists are booked solid and different types of therapy cults are springing up all over. Families are being dissolved at an unprecedented rate, suicides are up and the still rising crime rate cannot be slowed.

Where is the world really headed? If you don't at least have an opinion after reading this book, you are in serious trouble.

How can you protect yourself? Consider this 3,000 year old masterpiece of wisdom:

> *"Do not say, 'why is it that the former days were better than these?' For it is not from wisdom that you ask about this. Wisdom along with an inheritance is good and an advantage to those who see the sun. For wisdom is protection just as money is protection. But the advantage is that wisdom preserves the lives of its possessors. Consider the work of God, for who is able to straighten what He has bent? In the day of adversity*

consider - God has made the one as well as the other so that man may not discover anything that will be after him. "

King Solomon *Ecclesiastes* Ch. 7, v. 10 - 14

ENDNOTES PREFACE

1. Ayn Rand, *Anthem,* p. 12.

2. *Ecclesiastes,* Chapter 7, verses 10-14, New American Standard Bible.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Trilaterals Over Washington - Volume II, is the continuation from Volume I of the saga of the Trilateral elite. The areas of focus in Volume II are essentially different: we delve into the philosophy of "Globalism," new major economic developments, foreign policy and European Trilateralism.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the Trilateral Carter Administration was its pragmatic use of human rights for international elitist objectives. While Trilateral writing on human rights is scant, the Administration proclaimed to the world that it had deep concern for human rights around the world and that this concern was a basic premise of U.S. policy.

We have described in some detail how the Trilateral position on human rights is two-faced. On the one hand we present the plight of Russian Christians seeking refuge in the American Embassy in Moscow and attempts to have them returned to the dictatorship from which they were fleeing: their return will mean lengthy imprisonment as payment for their efforts to obtain human rights. On the other hand we point out the double standard with events in South Africa and Communist Hungary. Specific examples of Henry Kissinger's use of human rights as a so-called "gambling chip" are cited.

We have clearly set forth in Chapter Two the operating "philosophy" of Trilateralism, that is, *Humanism.* According to the Humanist Manifesto[1] (the "constitution" of Humanism), "No deity will save us: we must save ourselves." Pointedly atheistic, Humanism-Trilateralism is spewing out "saviors" who are implementing their own self-righteous programs while thinking they are doing us a favor by preparing a brighter future for mankind. But is it so innocent? You may not think so after seeing how Humanism and Communism both were spawned from the same group in the early 1900's. That the Trilaterals and Marxist countries can and do work together comfortably is no surprise.

Another area of concern to many Americans is the movement in schools across the country to create "global citizens" out of America's youth, paving the way for easy and painless implementation of "interdependence." This re-education of America is being funded by the same foundations that fund the Trilateral Commission. This is brought out in Chapter Three.

Chapters Four and Five take a look at the manner in which Trilateralism transcends political systems, particularly in the context of the historically erroneous theme of Capitalism versus Marxism. The broadly held idea that Capitalists are the enemies of Marxists misses the mark. The Trilateral Commission is continuing and indeed emphasizing a long-run cooperation between a segment of capitalist elitists and the emerging Marxist world. We cite, for example, former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, a member of the law firm, Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett; this is the same law firm that in October 1918 prevailed upon Woodrow Wilson to recognize the then-new Soviet regime in Russia.

Chapter Five also points out some history behind groups that have dominated foreign policy since at least 1921- the latest of which is the Trilateral Commission. Historically, the most important of these is the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) founded in 1920. But we should not ignore the Foreign Policy Association, the Atlantic Council and the Rockefeller Commission on Critical Choices for Americans. We show the extraordinary interlock between these organizations; for example, more than 24 percent of Trilaterals are also CFR members.

In Chapter Six we compare two examples of Trilateral foreign policy and human rights. First the case of Communist China and second the case of the Panama Canal Treaty. The Trilateral agreements with Communist China were concluded in the face of the murder of over one hundred million Chinese by the Communist regime.[2]

While China has possibly the worst record of genocide in history, it was overlooked for a reason similar to that in the early 1920's when Wall Street and the European financial elite built up the USSR - *profit.*

Normalization of relations with China will dramatically change the economic structure of the world within a few short years as the Trilateral process exploits slave labor in China at the expense of free labor forces in the US and abroad.

The Panama Canal debacle is another case of hypocrisy and double standards. That the Panama Canal had been bought and fully paid for many years ago by the U.S. was not discussed at the Congressional hearings that led to the giving away of the Canal. Would Texans squawk if the administration unilaterally gave Texas - undisputed U.S. territory - back to Mexico?

Understatement aside, we found that of the 30 or so banks that had made rather shaky loans to Panama, one half of them had at least one

Trilateral on their board of directors. Had Panama defaulted on these loans, some major international banks would have faced financial ruin - a scheme had to be implemented to restructure Panama's debts.

So **Sol Linowitz**, director of Marine Midland Bank, was dispatched as "temporary" treaty negotiator (that is, his appointment did not require Senate approval). Again, profit or the fear of loss of profit - dictated a solution clearly against the majority wishes of the US public, and against its security interests. The Panama Canal Treaty was conflict of interest at its utmost.

Chapter Seven details a new and major development as a direct result of normalization with China: economic trade among countries around the Pacific Ocean has dramatically outstripped its Atlantic counterpart. The Pacific Basin Institute, a think tank to monitor this booming trade and to offer policy "suggestions," is to be located near Scottsdale, Arizona. Away from the hustle and bustle of the West Coast, PBI was proposed by Arizona Governor **Bruce Babbitt** and Roger Lyon, president of Valley National Bank of Arizona and formerly a top executive with Chase Manhattan Bank in New York. This chapter is certainly the first critique of PBI, but was possible only because one of the authors of this book also lives in Scottsdale, Arizona and happened to see a reference to it in a local newspaper article.

The next to last chapter probes behind the 1980 presidential election. The evidence declares that Trilaterals were active in all three major campaigns. On the Democratic ticket, **James Carter** and **Walter Mondale** were both members of the Commission. Independent **John Anderson** was also a member. While Republican victor Ronald Reagan was not a member of the Trilateral Commission, many of his top advisors were, like **Casper Weinberger**, **David Packard**, **George Weyerhaeuser**, **Bill Brock**, **Anne Armstrong** and others. Two of these received major appointments.

In short, a victory for Reagan is certainly remote from a defeat for Trilateralism. Au contraire, Trilateralism will advance by leaps and bounds under a Reagan administration while a scarce few understand what is really going on.

The last chapter lightly covers European Trilateralism. While this topic could easily take several volumes in itself, we felt it was time to describe and analyze the European counterparts of Trilateralism. We show the link to the European Common Market, central banks and One

Europe, and briefly describe Trilateral distribution among the different European countries.

As you may have already noticed, current and former members of the Trilateral Commission appear in bold type throughout this book.

ENDNOTES, CHAPTER ONE:

1. John Dewey and et.al., *Humanist Manifesto I and II*, p. 16.

2. *Chinese Communist Document*, reproduced in L'Express, November I, 1980.

CHAPTER TWO

HUMANISM: THE GLOBAL IDEOLOGY

The word *Humanism* is often confused with the concept of *humaneism.* In fact, however, Humanism is a secular, non-theistic (atheistic) religion that believes man is capable of self-fulfillment, ethical conduct and salvation without supernatural intervention.

Roots of modern-day Humanism go back to at least fifth century B.C. to the Greek philosopher Protagoras who said, "Man is the measure of all things."[1] During the period of the Enlightenment, philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Georg Hegel (1770-1831) and slightly later Karl Marx (1818-1883), developed humanistic doctrines that have worked their way into the 20th century in the form of Humanism, Marxism, Socialism, Communism, Collectivism and Rationalism.

Rousseau wrote in *Emile*, "Only through the individual's participation in the 'common unity' can full personal maturity become possible... nature is still the norm, but one that has to be recreated, as it were, at a higher level, conferring on man a new rational unity which replaces the purely instinctive unity of the primitive state."[2] In *Du Contrat Social* he proposed a sort of civil religion or civic profession of faith to which every citizen after giving his free assent - must remain obedient under pain of death.[3]

Hegel coined the idea, "Freedom is not something merely opposed to constraint; on the contrary, it presupposes and requires restraint."[4] Like Rousseau, he contended that the individual could be "free" even when he is being coerced into it, and even though he would not like being forced, he must follow the "public will."

Karl Marx hated Christianity, Judaism and religion in general. He stated: "Criticism of religion is the foundation of all criticism."[5] Even in his own lifetime Marx was known as a militant atheist. All of his writings were directed toward destroying the middle "bourgeois" class by means of the working class, which was to result in a classless society.

At the turn of the century, Humanism was represented in the US by the American Ethical Union (The American Civil Liberties Union - ACLU - was the legal arm of the AEU.) In 1933 *Humanist Manifesto I*

was published in *The New Humanist,* Vol. VI, No.3, and in 1973 *Humanist Manifesto II* appeared in *The Humanist,* Vol. XXXIII, No. 5.[6]

The following selected quotes from *Humanist Manifesto II* will give you a general idea of its content:

> *"As in* 1933, *Humanists still believe that traditional theism, especially faith in the prayer-hearing God, assumed to love and care for persons, to hear and understand their prayers, and to be able to do something about them, is an unproved and outmoded faith. . . Reasonable minds look to other means for survival... False 'theologies of hope' and messianic ideologies, substituting new dogmas for old, cannot cope with existing world realities... No deity will save us, we must save ourselves".*
>
> *"Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction."*[7] [Authors' Note: This gave birth to the phrase, "if it feels good, do it."]
>
> *"In the area of sexuality, we believe that intolerant attitudes, often cultivated by orthodox religions and puritanical cultures unduly repress sexual conduct".*[8]
>
> *"We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate. "*
>
> *"We believe in the peaceful adjudication of differences by international courts and by the development of the arts of negotiation and compromise. War is obsolete. So is the use of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. "*
>
> *"The problems of economic growth and development can no longer be resolved by one nation alone; they are worldwide in scope."*
>
> *'Technology is the vital key to human progress and development. "*
>
> *"We urge that parochial loyalties and inflexible moral and religious ideologies be transcended. Destructive ideological*

differences among communism, capitalism, socialism, conservatism, liberalism, and radicalism should be overcome."

'[Humanism]... transcends the narrow allegiances of church, state, party, class or race in moving toward a wider vision of human potentiality. What more daring a goal for humankind than for each person to become, in ideal as well as practice, a citizen of a world community. "[9]

Corliss Lamont is one of the most prolific writers on Humanism, and is literally "Mr. Humanism" in regard to awards, mentions, etc. in humanistic circles. Lamont authored *The Philosophy of Humanism* (1977) and noted "A truly Humanist civilization must be a world civilization."[10] He further wrote:

"Humanism is not only a philosophy with a world ideal, but is an ideal philosophy for the world... surmounting all national and sectional provincialisms, provides a concrete opportunity for overcoming the age-long cleavage between East and West. It is the philosophic counterpart of world patriotism"[11]

"The principle around which the United Nations and the International Court of Justice are organized is that the scope of national sovereignty must be curtailed and that nations must be willing to accept, as against what they conceived to be their own self-interest, the democratically arrived at decisions of the world community. "[12]

There is an extraordinary parallelism between Humanists and Marxists. Among the more obvious are:

- rejection of traditional Christianity and religion
- the necessity for subordination of the individual to state and the community
- catchwords of both Humanism and Marxism are "democracy, peace and high standard of living"
- individual rights and beliefs are non-existent
- collectivism is supreme.

CORLISS LAMONT AND THE MORGAN FINANCIAL GROUP

Corliss Lamont (previously quoted as a prime source of humanist philosophy) is the son of Thomas W. Lamont.

Let's to back to the First World War.

Thomas W. Lamont (1870-1948) was one of the original organizers of the Round Table group cited by Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope.*[13]

Lamont's autobiography is appropriately entitled *Across World Frontiers.* He was not only a senior partner in J.P. Morgan & Co., but was also a director of Guaranty Trust Company, International Harvester Co. (with its Trilateral directors today) and the law firm of Lamont Corliss & Co. Thomas Lamont was a key figure in the Morgan financial group. (For further information and extensive documentation on the links between J.P. Morgan and the development of the early Soviet Union, see *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* by Antony Sutton.)

Mrs. Thomas Lamont was a member of several unusual organizations:

- Federal Union
- American-Russian Institute (on the Attorney General's subversive list)
- National Council of American-Soviet Friendship
- American Committee for Friendship with the Soviet Union...

and numerous others. (See above citation for full list.)

In short, the Lamont family epitomizes the links between:

- Humanism
- Communism
- New York financial interests

THE ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES

Humanism today is being "taught" throughout the business world by the Aspen Institute, particularly to the multinational corporation community. The major financiers of Aspen also are the major financiers of Trilateralism, and no less than seven members of the Trilateral Commission also serve at the Aspen Institute.

The Aspen Institute was founded in 1949 by Professor Giuseppe Borgese, Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins (both of University of Chicago) and Walter Paepcke, a Chicago businessman. In 1957, Robert O. Anderson became chairman, and has been its guiding force ever since. In 1969, chairmanship switched to Joseph E. Slater, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and formerly of the Ford Foundation.

In the past the editors have reported the connections between the **Rockefeller** Family and the University of Chicago and also between the Ford Foundation and the Trilateral Commission.

The two leading foundations contributing to Aspen are Atlantic-Richfield (ARCO) and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Moreover, the largest single institutional shareholder in ARCO is Chase Manhattan (4.5%) and the largest individual shareholder is Robert O. Anderson, who is also on the board of directors of Chase Manhattan Bank.

FUNDING OF ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR
HUMANISTIC STUDIES - 1979 COLORADO

Atlantic Richfield Foundation	$900,000	Long term support
Atlantic Richfield Foundation	250,000	Humanities & Arts Program
Atlantic Richfield Foundation	35,250	Environmental Program
Weyerhaeuser Foundation	15,000	To underwrite planning for project "Consequences of a hypothetical world climate change"
Rockefeller Foundation	150,000	To "bring together integrated and emerging leaders from all sectors of society to discuss and help shape policy by recommendations on contemporary issues."
Rockefeller Foundation	15,000	"Cost of executive seminar on women and men in a changing society."
Rockefeller Foundation	148,000	"Arms control and international security."
SEPTEMBER 1, 1980 – WASHINGTON D.C.		
Carnegie Corporation	$15,000	"Seminar series of Committee for the Third Sector"

	NEW YORK	
Prudential Foundation	$10,000	
Ford Foundation	24,395	Conference on student aid policies
Ford Foundation	5,000	Comparative study of state judicial systems
Markle Foundation	220,000	"To provide forum for investigation and discussion of communication in modern society, specifically to investigate relationship between choice in programming content and increasing number of distribution channels for communications"
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	30,000	"Islamic Middle East program"
Kettering Foundation	28,000	"Developing the CEO: educating the integrative leader"

The Markle Foundation (a substantial Aspen backer) is less well known but leads us back to New York banks - in this case to the Morgan Guaranty group. Markle Foundation chairman is Charles F. Biddle, also chairman of the credit policy group of Morgan Guaranty Trust. Walter H. Page is president of Morgan Guaranty Trust and president of J.P. Morgan. Another director, William M. Rees, is a director of First National City Bank.

In short, it seems the private financing for the Aspen Institute comes from the international banks in New York City, and more specifically, from foundations controlled by Rockefeller and Morgan interests. *Donors support activities which reflect their objectives.*

PUBLIC FINANCING OF ASPEN

In **Brzezinski**'s book, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era,* he wrote in reference to a proposed constitutional convention, "The needed change is more likely to develop incrementally and less overtly... in keeping with the American tradition of blurring distinctions between public and private institutions."[14] A prime Trilateral objective is to blur the distinction between "private" and "public" operations so as to divert public funds into private projects set up by Trilaterals to achieve Trilateral objectives.

A Freedom of Information Act request for information on public financing granted to Aspen was submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities. We received the following list of NEH grants:

Ad-20009-80-1434
PI: Stephen P. Strickland
Title: Aspen Institute/ United Way Bicentennial Project
Amount: $350,000 G&M (to date $90,000)
AP-00132-79-1297
PI: Robert B. McKay
Title: Development of the Justice Program
Amount: $15,000 outright
Grant Period: 11-1-76 to 6-30-80
CA-28286-77-0616
PI: Stephen Strickland/Aspen Institute
Title: Challenge Grant
Amount: $645,000
Grant Period: 11-1-76 to 6-30-80[15]

SUMMARY OF ASPEN INSTITUTE FUNDING

In brief, Aspen Institute has been funded from the following sources, taking 1979 as a representative year:

U.S. Taxpayer (via National Endowment for the Humanities)	$1,010,000
Atlantic Richfield Foundation	1,186,250
Rockefeller Foundation	343,000
Markle Foundation (Morgan financial interests)	220,000
Other Foundations	97,000

The key point to note is the heavy representation of donations that have also financed Trilateralism: these include Weyerhaeuser, Rockefeller, Ford and Kettering.

THE ASPEN EXECUTIVE SEMINAR PROGRAM

While central offices of Aspen are in New York City, it has "centers of activity" (i.e. seminar and housing facilities) in Washington, D.C.,

Cambridge, Princeton, New Haven, Boulder, Hawaii, Tokyo and Berlin.

According to an Aspen publication:

> *"The idea behind the Aspen Institute has three essential ingredients: to gather thoughtful men and women around the table, not across the table; to explore the power of ideas in great literature stretching from ancient to contemporary time, and to translate ideas into policies and actions that meet the challenge of our age.*
>
> *"In view of the rapidly increasing worldwide activities of the Institute, its international Board of Trustees and key staff act on the Institute's long-standing principle to maintain absolute control over the selection of individual participants and their mix in all its meetings, the locations at which its meetings are held, as well as the subjects to be discussed.* "[16]

At these meetings, a hotchpotch of corporate executives, military people, intellectuals and media personages "mingle" and become "educated," typically for a period of two weeks at a time. This subtle form of brainwashing on global affairs is coupled with the breaking down of hard line principled positions through peer pressure. As Wilbur Mills once said, "To get along you have to go along."

This is quite successful. For example, Newsweek reports that Bill Moyers (a special adviser to Aspen Institute) has drawn more than ten of his Public Broadcasting Service programs from contacts and ideas developed at Aspen.[17] PBS is supported by many of the same foundations that support the Aspen Institute and Trilateralism in addition to large amounts of *public money* (Corporation for Public Broadcasting, etc.). Once again we observe a "blurring" of institutions where elitists combine their money with public financing to achieve their own ends and spread their global propaganda.

THE FUND FOR GOVERNANCE

According to the Institute's *A Brief Overview:*

> *"...the Institute is undertaking a sustained examination of crucial issues of Governance: how societies and their governments and institutions, public and private, national and international, can better respond to the often conflicting pressures for social justice, fairness, efficiency and individual*

freedom. Under this broad theme of Governance, the Institute focuses on such subjects as Financing the Future; Human Rights; The Corporation and Society; Energy; A Challenge to Governance; Tradition and Modernization; The First 20 Years of Life; Ethics; Religion and Governance; Work, Industrial Policy and Society; and Structures for Peace.

While these issues of Governance will be pursued throughout the year and around the globe, the preeminent setting for the dealing with Governance questions is the Institute's newly acquired Wye Plantation outside of Washington, D. C. "[18]

Why should the Aspen Institute undertake this program? It merely quotes from Edmund Burke, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."[19] Apparently the Institute equates itself with the "good men."

The Institute proposes to raise about $15 million for operating capital for this project. An annual budget of at least $1.2 million will provide a staff of senior fellows and consultants (about $450,000 per year) with workshops, seminars and consultative sessions and publications costing about $600,000 a year.

The Atlantic Richfield Company provided the first grant of $1 million and it is anticipated that another $3 million will be raised from corporations and foundations. As much as $6 million could come from *public* funds - either congressional appropriations or through the National Endowment for the Humanities grants.

Some of the participants in this program will not surprise you: Harlan Cleveland, John Gardner, Trilateral **Henry Kissinger,** Marion Doenhoff and Pehr Gyllenhammar.

Without question, this Aspen program is a well-funded attack on Constitutional America.

CONCLUSIONS

- Humanism is a man-centered, atheistic religion inconsistent with and indeed utterly opposed to traditional Christianity, Biblical theology or Orthodox Judaism.
- The philosophy has been nurtured and promoted by the same group of globalists that nurtures and supports communism.

- Humanism is intimately connected with Trilateralism, and calls for the elimination of nationalism and nationalistic boundaries.
- Trilateral-style Humanism is procreated primarily by The Aspen Institute, and is funded by taxpayers' money as well as by private foundation and corporate funds.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER TWO

1. Protagoras, *Protagoras IV*, 51.

2. J.J. Rousseau, *Emile.*

3. ---, *Du Contrat Social.*

4. Paul Edwards, *Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*

5. Ibid.,

6. Both of these Manifestos are available from Prometheus Books, 923 Kensington Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14215.

7. John Dewey et al, *Humanist Manifesto I and II*, p. 14-16.

8. Ibid., p. 17, 18.

9. Ibid., p. 21-23.

10. Corliss Lamont, *The Philosophy of Humanism*, p. 281.

11. Ibid., p. 282, 283.

12. Ibid., p. 257, 258.

13. Ibid.

14. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, p.259.

15. *Report of Financing Granted to Aspen Institute*, National Endowment for the Humanities, 14th report (1979).

16. *The Aspen Institute: a Brief Overview*, Aspen Institute.

17. Eric Gelman, *The Great American Salon*, Newsweek XCVI (July 14, 1980), p. 66.
18. Aspen Institute, Op. Cit.

19. Edmund Burke, *Letter to William Smith*, January 9, 1795.

CHAPTER THREE

GLOBAL SCHOOLING: THE RE-EDUCATION OF AMERICA

> *"National security today involves more than military preparation. Global education is one of the essential new dimensions.*
>
> *"The globalization of the human condition is interweaving the destinies of all nations and peoples at an accelerating rate and affecting many aspects of life. Global education involves multidisciplinary perspectives about the extended human family, the existing condition of mankind and the planet, and foreseeable consequences of present trends and alternative choices."*[1]

Note that the above was written by Robert Leestma of the U.S. Office of Education, a contributor to the 1979 book, *Schooling for a Global Age* (See bibliography).

While the previous chapter detailed the religion of Humanism and its thrust behind Trilateralism, this chapter seeks to document a massive re-education program of American school age children - and unwilling parents, who remain a major obstacle to a smooth transition to a global society.

On the back dust cover of the above quoted book, it is noted:

> *"This book is one of a series of three books on issues and practices in schooling. The other two books deal with the arts and education and with school-community relations. The series was commissioned to provide background information for A Study of Schooling in the United States, the results of which will be published subsequently.* "[2]

Also noted are the financial backers of the studies:

> The Danforth Foundation
> *The John D. Rockefeller III Fund*
> Martha Holden Jennings Foundation
> *Charles F. Kettering Foundation*
> Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

The Needmor Fund
The Rockefeller Foundation
The Spencer Foundation
U.S. Office of Education
National Institute of Education[3]

Emphasis is added to note two things: first, the Rockefeller and Kettering foundations originally funded the Trilateral Commission. Second, public funds are intermixed with private funds to facilitate and implement a non-public supported or authorized endeavor.

We have chosen to analyze *Schooling for a Global Age* because of its authority of scholarship, financial backing and impact. It is not an *"official"* US government publication, but government officials are quoted and substantial government funds were provided so the study could be undertaken.

In light of this, we can be sure the book typifies the thinking of the National Education Association (NEA), the Department of Education, the various foundations listed and most importantly, the thinking of David Rockefeller et al.

A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

Keeping in mind the last chapter dealing with Humanism, the following *"purpose statement"* exemplifies the Humanist philosophy on global education:

- *"To develop student understanding of themselves as individuals.*
- 'To *develop student understanding of themselves as members of the human species.*
- *"To develop student understanding of themselves as inhabitants and dependents of planet Earth.*
- *"To develop student understanding of themselves as participants in global society.*
- *"To develop within students the competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of global society.*

"*...We endeavor to create in world-centered schools the kind of social order, the organizational climate, the physical*

environment, and the formal curriculum that support and further the purposes of global education."[4]

"Identities, loyalties, and competencies as well as rights, duties, obligations, and privileges are associated with each of these goals. For example, students might explore the issues involved and discuss the rights one has by virtue of being a member of the human species. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Humanist Manifesto, and UNICEF and the Rights of the Child are among many documents and other materials which can be used in considering this question. "[5]

According to Irving H. Buchen, the student "*...will be capable of sustaining many allegiances, without contradiction, on both a national and international scale, and be closer to being, especially through the concept of global perspectives, a world citizen."*[6]

The Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies paper, *American Education and Global Interdependence,* states:

"The educational enterprise has a vital role to play in preparing present and future generations of Americans to cope with inter-dependence. Universities contain intellectual skills needed to develop the knowledge base about global interdependence; developing a more secure knowledge base should facilitate greatly the building of political consensus on what we should do about global interdependence.

The mass media by their very nature are event-centered, imposing on schools and colleges an obligation to provide students with the continuity and depth of understanding demanded by complex long-term interdependence issues.

Schools, furthermore, have the golden opportunity, if they will but use it, of shaping the world views of future generations of Americans along lines more compatible with the realities of global interdependence before these views become hardened through maturation along other less compatible lines. "[7]

Global education requires the conversion of existing local educational systems - primarily those at the elementary and secondary school levels - to produce students who see themselves not as Americans but as participants in a world society.

Why? Because *"nationalism"* and *"individualism"* are lumped in with the" *other less compatible lines."*

Society must be planned, they say, in overt and covert ways; individual ethnic, cultural and intellectual differences will be subordinated to some predetermined set of characteristics set forth by the elitist group preparing us for global interdependence.

AN ACTION PLAN IS UNDERWAY

The Aspen Institute study noted, *"The task of bringing about the kind of transformation which will make education a better instrument for coping with interdependence is formidable."*[8] To achieve their plan, global educators propose to identify and concentrate action upon what they call *"critical leverage points"* in our present educational system.

The plan is to subvert and change these critical points into a program to achieve global goals. When analyzed, Aspen's six point plan of action is nothing less than cultural genocide:

> *"Point 1: Revise curricula, the content of teacher training and community education toward global education. It is proposed to use the U.S. Department of Education as well as independent foundations and local school systems for this purpose.*
>
> *"Point* 2: *To obtain support from political and educational leaders at both national and local levels, particularly from boards of trustees and professional or organizations, to mold public support for global education.*
>
> *"Point* 3: *To use universities and research institutions to develop a "knowledge base" on interdependence in order to help build the political consensus necessary for global policies.*
>
> *"Point* 4: *To shape existing world outlooks within American popular culture.*
>
> *"Point* 5: *To reach outward to the world through educational institutes, particularly through the United Nations.*
>
> *"Point* 6: *To influence mass media to these ends, particularly through the use of internships that are part of professional training in mass communications.*"[9]
>
> (Authors' note: there are many college-age students who have been raised in prototype *"global schools"* who think in global terms and can be *"interned"* in strategic places within the media.)

Aspen makes it clear that this is an *activist* plan: *"Achieving the educational transformation, which the future demands will require all of the spirit of conquest and aspiration which we possess."*[10]

CENTRALIZED, GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED EDUCATION REQUIRED

Globalists recognize that American education is essentially decentralized and that public education has historically played a role in the teaching of American history and government. Thus, one objective is to heavily reduce the amount of time devoted to the study of these subjects now required in the curricula of most states. These America-oriented curricula will be replaced with ones concentrating on world history and politics.

They describe the current educational system as a *"constitutional incongruity."* Certain constitutional conflicts do exist which cannot be overcome as long as education remains in the hands of local and state governments. A major answer to this was the creation of the Department of Education, which was heavily lobbied by the global-minded National Education Association (NEA).

The Aspen study also cited Roger Ulrich's *The Control of Human Behavior*. According to Ulrich, conditioning is supposed to start at the age of two years.[11] It is recognized within the global education community that the critical years for the establishment of values and ideas is around seven to twelve. Consequently, it is planned to subject students to a curricula which employs behavioral techniques involving so-called *"values clarification"* and situational ethics.

This manipulates students into an artificial belief structure. Who picks the values they will be taught? Which set of ethics will be used?

These techniques are close to those of Goebbels' in Nazi Germany, or Soviet and Chinese propagandists of today. These are programs for human behavioristic manipulation, not education!

THE PLAN IS UNDERWAY

Don't make the mistake of underestimating the forces behind global schooling. This is not some passive, *"pie-in-the-sky"* ideological exercise of academia - it is highly organized, completely funded and well staffed. It is sweeping the country.

The following *"timetable"* is quoted *exactly* from pages 240-241 of *Schooling for a Global Age.*

"PHASE 1, PREPARATORY PERIOD - BY 1980:

- *Every state education department and most school systems and teacher education programs would have a collection of some basic references on global education and would have provided opportunities for selected staff members to become aware of the global education concept, some relevant research, successful programs elsewhere, and local possibilities.*
- *In-service education programs would be available in every region of the country to begin to acquaint teachers and others with the global education concept.*
- *A survey of the role of the world in the community, region, or state and vice versa would have been conducted, planned, or under consideration in a majority of states.*

"PHASE 2 - BY THE MID-1980s:

- *Study groups would be at work in a sizeable proportion of state education departments, local school systems, and teacher education institutions to analyze and enrich existing curricula, requirements, and materials from a global perspective.*
- *In-service education opportunities would be available in the majority of states, including through teacher centers.*
- *Pre-service education programs would be offering some orientation to global education, at least as an option.*
- *Initial research agendas would be established and studies and surveys begun.*
- *A national baseline survey of the knowledge and attitudes of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community leaders on global education concerns would be completed.*
- *Every state education department and a sizeable proportion of school districts would become involved in an international educational exchange program for students and/ or staff*
- *State and local school board policy statements would be giving explicit support to global education.*
- *National public awareness and local community support would be growing, in part, because of increased attention to global*

problems and issues in the mass media, particularly television, and in the schools.

"PHASE 3 - BY 1990:

- *Teachers in every state would have access to in-service education programs for global education, at least at the awareness level.*
- *Good case-study material on the initiation or improvement of global education programs in a variety of school and community situations would be becoming widely available.*
- *All school districts, state education departments, and pre-service teacher-education programs would have access to information clearinghouses and resource centers on global perspectives in education.*
- *Teacher certification requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education concerns.*
- *State curriculum requirements in a sizeable number of states would begin to reflect global education objectives.*
- *School accreditation requirements would begin to reflect attention to global education.*
- *Local, state, and national assessments of educational progress would include attention to global educational concerns.*
- *Textbooks and other educational materials would increasingly provide more adequate treatment of global issues and perspectives.* "[12]

PARENTS NEED TO BE EDUCATED ALSO

John I. Goodlad wrote in *Schooling for a Global Age:*

> *"Parents and the general public must be reached also. Otherwise, children and youth enrolled in globally oriented programs may find themselves in conflict with values assumed in the home. And then the educational institution frequently comes under scrutiny and must pull back.* "[13]

The question basically boils down to this: *"Are your values good enough for your children, or not?"* We have passed through the UN-sponsored "International Year of the Child" which preached children's

rights. In Sweden it is now against the law to spank your own child - who could report *you* to the authorities for *"maltreatment."*

This thought is expanded:

"Parents should understand that developing independent individuals is not a goal of government education,- and this becomes apparent only with an understanding of the educator's view of an individual: 'The emerging modern individual places his confidence not in society's norms, not religion's rules, nor parents' dictates, but in his own changing experience. He is, in a very deep sense, his own highest authority. He chooses his own way.' "[14]

The greatest obstacle to the implementing of global schooling is not lack of funding, trained teachers or global textbooks - it is the *parent* who is skeptical about the federal government (with its blurred distinctions between private and public institutions) being better qualified to say how his child should be raised and educated.

"Rebel" parents who have chosen to educate their children at home have become *"examples"* to globalists who drag the parents into court on civil and criminal charges of negligence.

Private schools across the country have continuously fought an onslaught of legislation that would destroy them, if passed. Whenever a student is transferred to a private school, the public school he or she attended loses state and federal budget funds for the following year. In many cases, the formula for determining funding is disproportionate to the total number of students in attendance; thus, if 40% of the students withdrew to private schools, those schools could lose 70 or 80% of its funding. This is intolerable to public educators, and pressure is put on the parent to re-enroll the student in public school.

One of the key activist groups that deals with parent as well as student problems is the National Education Association (NEA); possibly it is the most powerful special interest group in operation today. The NEA sent more delegates to the Democratic National Convention in 1980 than *any* other interest group including trade unions.

The NEA worked closely with the Trilaterally oriented Carter administration in setting up the long sought after Federal Department of Education to centralize US education.

A national movement was recently underway to pass legislation allowing tuition tax credits for parents of students enrolled in private

schools. This is not surprising in that they are paying for two educations at the same time - private *and* public. If passed, it would have dealt a fatal blow to global educators because it would have encouraged parents to seek better, private education for their children; in turn, public schools would have their funding automatically chopped. The National Education Association was successful at blocking this legislation.

HOW GLOBAL EDUCATION IS BEING FINANCED

We noted earlier that the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies is funded primarily by Atlantic Richfield, Rockefeller, Kettering, Weyerhaeuser, Ford and the Markle Foundations. In addition, we saw that almost 40% of Aspen's funding came from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

NEH granted a whopping total of $185.3 million in 1979 to many different Humanistic and globalist endeavors, including Aspen Institute. While the US taxpayer contributes about 80% of NEH's annual funding, the remaining 20% comes from Lilly Endowment, the Ford Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon and Alfred P. Sloan Foundations.

Watchers of the Public Broadcasting System will see many global-oriented shows sponsored by Ford Foundation.

The Kettering Foundation, a main backer of the Trilateral Commission, has as its purpose statement: *"To strengthen the mechanisms for citizen participation in public policy formation and implementation, and to support the forces for world order and peace. It supports only innovative, high-risk programs which do not receive sufficient attention from other sources.* "[15]

Table I gives you an idea of what Kettering considers *"innovative, high risk."*

TABLE I

SELECTED CHARLES F. KETTERING FOUNDATION

Action For a Better Community ($9,300) Rochester, NY. 2/ 15/79. For handbook, *How to Develop an Insurance Cooperative.* and to identify settings in which cooperative development would provide	*National League of Cities* ($100,000) DC. 12/15/78. For program with U.S. Civil Service Commission Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs to improve *group skills and policy management systems* of

alternative to disruptive market forces at the neighborhood level.

Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies ($28,000) NYC, NY. 1/15/78. 2-year grant. To cosponsor studies and seminars on economic modernization in the People's Republic of China.

Cornell University ($24,000) Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Ithaca, NY. 11/15/78. For project Ecology of Human Development, studying *child development* in relation to child care, education, and family support system policies and practices.

municipal policy makers in selected demonstrations cities, and *to develop national network of trainers of elected officials.*

Policy Sciences Center ($40,000) NYC, NY. 2/13/78. To develop process for *direct unofficial discussion* between multinational corporations and less developed countries' leaders.

Stanford University ($29,376) U.S. - China Relations Program, Stanford, CA. 9/1/78. To continue project, Technology Policy and Development in People's Republic of China, focusing on areas of research and development for food production and telecommunications in China.[16]

We noted earlier that Kettering was a supporter of *Schooling for a Global Age.* That book also states, *"Sub-study on the teaching of global education in schools [is] supported by an additional grant from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.*"[17] (Emphasis added.)

Among the Kettering directorship, we find two notable Humanists: George Gallup and Norman Cousins. Cousins is a director of National Educational Television and the U.N. Association of the U.S. Gallup surveys, which are supposed to be so *"unbiased,"* are usually called for when globalists want to *"prove"* their case to the public by doing a public opinion survey.

While the authors have not done an exhaustive tabulation on the amount of money distributed by public and private institutions for globalist ends, it is estimated that well over $1 billion per year is sunk into *"high risk"* programs that would otherwise find *no support.*

MASS MEDIA AND THE MARKLE FOUNDATION

The Markle Foundation was identified as a prime contributor to the Aspen Institute and ties to the Morgan banking establishment were noted in the previous chapter.

Markle's statement of purpose reads: *"The goal of the current program is to strengthen educational uses of the mass media and communications technology."*[18]

This foundation deserves extra space as a prime purveyor of global education. The president of Markle Foundation is Lloyd N. Morrisett. Over ten years ago, when Morrisett was a vice-president of Carnegie Corporation, he and Joan Cooney (wife of Trilateralist **Peter G. Peterson**) originated the idea for *Sesame Street.* He is currently chairman of the board of trustees at *Children's Television Workshop,* which produces Sesame Street.

According to the 1978 Annual Report of the Markle Foundation:

> *"In its first operating year, 1969-1970, the Workshop had* 36 *employees and a budget of$6.8 million. Almost all this money came from three sources: The Office of Education, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Ford Foundation. The Workshop itself was able to provide only $119,000 from its own income. "*[19]

It later stated that:

> *"CTW has established its status as a public charity under the Tax Reform Act of* 1969. *The value of the public charity classification to an organization such as CTW is that it allows the receipt of individual or corporate contributions on a fully tax deductible basis for the donor. It also facilitates philanthropic donations by foundations. "*[20]

Which foundations contribute to support Sesame Street so it can stay on the air? Surprisingly, not Markle Foundation, even though they are closely linked, Markle spends its funds on more *"high risk"* ventures just starting out (see Table II).

What is interesting to see is that these ventures, like Sesame Street, were persistently bailed out financially, year after year, because they could not make their own way. Further, major funds to this end came from *your* taxes, as well as various foundations.

CONCLUSIONS:

- A main tenet of Humanism is to institute global education to create a generation of "global citizens."

- Global education is being financed by the same foundations that finance Humanism and the Trilateral Commission.
- Massive amounts of public funds are also being used to these ends.
- There is a plan, a timetable, sufficient personnel and funds to carry out the plan.
- Global education ideology is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

TABLE II

1975

65,213 to Cable Arts Foundation. For development of arts programming on cable television.

$35,000 to Rand Corporation, Communications Policy Program. For beginning research to identify and measure the size of special interest audiences for public television.

$112,000 to University of California, School of Medicine, Laboratory for the Study of Human Interaction & Conflict, Psychiatric Department. For field study of the effects of television on children.

$92,298 to University of Minnesota, School of Journalism and Mass communication, Communication Research Division. To pursue research on ways in which children are influenced by pro-social television content.

1976

$2,500 to The Rand Corporation. Support of the publication and distribution of a study on new evaluation methods for "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company."

$29,000 to the University of Wisconsin, Mass Communications Research Center. Support of a study of the influence of mass communications on young voters.

1977

$14,189 to American Assembly. To sponsor an American Assembly to discuss the ways the mass media in the United States shapes the politics of Presidential selection.

$170,000 to Aspen Institute. Support of Aspen Program on Communications and Society.

$19,425 to Cultural Council foundation. Support for Independent Cinema Artists and Producers to act as a distributor with pay television systems for independent film and video artists.

$70,887 to Harvard University. Two studies to examine how children come to understand the television medium and the steps where they learn to make distinction between fantasy and reality[21]

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER THREE

I. Robert Leestma, *Schooling for a Global Age,* ed. James M. Becker, p. 233. 2. Ibid., Dust cover.

3. Ibid., Dust cover.

4. Lee and Charlotte Anderson, Op. cit., pg. 8.

5. James Becker, Op. cit., pg. 41.

6. Irving Buche, *Learning for Tomorrow,* ed. Alvin Toffler, p. 137.

7. *American Education and Global Interdependence,* Aspen Institute.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Roger Ulrich, *Control of Human Behavior.*

12. Robert Leestman, Op. cit., p. .240, 241.

13. John I. Goodlad, Ibid., 17.

14. Carl Rogers, *Courses by Newspaper.*

15. *Charles F. Kettering Foundation Annual Report,* 1979.

16. Ibid., p. 36.

17. James Becker, Op. cit., p. vii.

18. *Markle Foundation Annual Report* (1977), p. 4.

19. Ibid., p. 8.

20. Ibid., p. 17.

21. Ibid., p. 58-{j5.

CHAPTER FOUR

TRANSCENDING POLITICAL SYSTEMS: CAPITALISTS VS. MARXISTS

One of the most pervasive - but downright erroneous themes in modem textbook history is that of a competition between Capitalist and Marxist systems. In fact, given objective examination of all facts nothing could be further from the truth. The two political power groups cooperate with each other, nurture each other and in general are jointly responsible for much of the pain and suffering of the average man on the street in this world.

Much of the confusion stems from an unwillingness to define monopoly capitalism for what it is: a political power system that is much like state socialism. State socialism, as in the Soviet Union, is also remarkably akin in its operations to that of a monopoly. Thus, a Brezhnev and a Rockefeller have much in common. Both are monopolists and both thrive on use of political power to retain their monopoly.

With this parallel in mind, let's summarize the facts on the almost continuous involvement of American elitist capitalists in the buildup of Soviet military power over the past 63 years. It has been a deliberate policy. That it was done shortsightedly for financial gain is rather obvious. No one - not even a multinational businessman - commits suicide knowingly, but it is not unheard of for avarice to overcome common sense.

Apparently only one US institution has been clear-sighted on the buildup of Soviet power. *From the early 1920's until recently only one institution has spoken out.* That institution is the AFL-CIO. From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany, major unions consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet military power. Why? Because workers in Russia lost their freedom with the Bolshevik Revolution, and the products used to expedite the killing of union members in Korea and Vietnam were made with the help of American elitist controlled multinational company technology. *But today Trilateral Commissioner Kirkland rules the AFL-CIO and the protest is muted.*

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION (1917)

The March, 1917, Russian Revolution overthrew the regime of the Romanov Czars and installed a free, constitutional government. In November the fledgling republic was destroyed by the totalitarian Bolsheviks and the Russian hope for freedom evaporated. The powerful American elite was involved because *Wall Street financiers* and attorneys intervened in support of the Bolsheviks. A few examples of this support are:

- Key Wall Streeters assisting the Bolsheviks included William Boyce Thompson (director of Chase National, forerunner of Chase Manhattan), Albert H. Wiggin (president of Chase Bank), establishment attorneys and Morgan bankers.

- The Wall Street bankers pressured the US and British governments to support Bolsheviks, much as **Rockefeller** and **Kissinger** pressured **Carter** into admitting the Shah of Iran into the US in 1979. *The Wall Street pressures were to assist Bolshevik propaganda, encourage formation of a Soviet army and supply arms to the Bolsheviks.*

- Some statements by American elitist businessmen on the early Soviets include the following letter from William Saunders, chairman of Ingersoll-Rand Corporation, to President Wilson, on October 17, 1918: "Dear Mr. President: I am in sympathy with the Soviet form of government as that best suited for the Russian people."[1]

- And another from Thomas D. Thacher, Wall Street attorney and member of the establishment law firm Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (former Secretary of State **Vance** is today a member of this same firm): ". . .The fullest assistance should be given to the Soviet government in its efforts to organize a volunteer revolutionary army."[2]

Wall Street bankers, including Chase National bankers, aided the Bolshevik Revolution by intervention with the United States and British governments and were crucial to its success.

THE EARLY YEARS OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Wall Street then came to the aid of the newborn Soviet government. Armand Hammer (now chairman of the Occidental Petroleum

Corporation) received the first concession contract in 1920 because his father, Julius Hammer, was then Secretary of the Communist Party in the US. However, the **Rockefellers** were not far behind. Under the guidance of Reeve Schley (a Chase VP) the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce was formed in partnership with Russian agents to break the U.S. government ban on trade with the Soviets.

What could not be done legally was done illegally - even to the export of military aircraft engines. *By the late 1920's Wall Street and German bankers had put the infant Soviet Russia on its feet.*

In 1925, a complete program to finance imports of Soviet raw material to the United States and to export vital machinery and technology to the Soviets was agreed upon by Chase National and Prombank (a German bank).

At the same time - even though a government ban still existed on all trade with the Soviet Union - Chase National was trying to arrange for export of Liberty motors for military planes. Years later, when writing *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development*, the co-author (Sutton) found the evidence in State Department files and learned that the Department of Justice was one step ahead of Chase National and intervened to stop illegal exports.

Along with Equitable Trust, Chase National was in the forefront of financing Soviet economic and military development in the 1920's. When acceptance of gold was halted by the State Department, the Chase-Soviet business was arranged on the basis of platinum credits.

Above all, the formation of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, with Chase VP Reeve Schley as its president, was the major factor in circumventing the ban on US technology for the Soviet Union. The Chamber was active in pressing the need for "cooperation" and "peaceful trade." The Chamber representative in Moscow was none other than Charles Haddell Smith, previously in Soviet employ and a member of the Soviet Peasant International.

By the late 1920's, Chase was even attempting to raise loans for the Soviets in the US, the first being a $30 million deal with principal and interest, payable in dollars - flatly prohibited by State Department regulations.

We also find in State Department files, letters from Chase refusing to break off the illegal relationship when instructed to do so. Public comment at that time was more caustic than in today's tame media.

Chase was called - among the more delicate descriptions - "an international fence," "a disgrace to America... They will go to any lengths for a few dollars profit."[3]

This intimate link between Chase National (which became Chase Manhattan in the 1950's) and the Soviets is unbroken throughout six decades. .

THE FIRST FIVE YEAR PLANS (1930-45)

In 1930, Chase National was one of four American banks that financed construction of the Five-Year Plans (master plans devised to expedite economic expansion through rapid industrialization of the once largely agricultural society) and, according to State Department files, its advisor was Soviet agent Alexander Ginsberg. In 1930, according to the U.S. Treasury, *all* Soviet accounts were with the Chase National Bank. Today the principal Chase Manhattan correspondent bank in Russia is Narodny Bank.

The Five-Year Plans have been hailed in the history books as a triumph of Soviet engineering. In fact, the Plans were entirely packaged and implemented by non-Russian companies mostly American - for the profit of Wall Street. **Rockefeller** interests received a large portion of the money that flowed from this initial effort to modernize the Soviet Union. This included its war industries, ammunition, modern aircraft, tanks and warships.

WORLD WAR II

Lend Lease (the US program offering assistance to the Allies during World War II) provided the means for the Soviets to resist Nazi aggression. The Soviet Union was the recipient of the latest in US military technology during World War II - once again for the profit of large US multinationals.

POST WORLD WAR II

The buildup of Soviet economic and military power has continued from 1945 down to the present day under the guise of peaceful trade.

A good example is the truck industry: any truck plant that produces civilian trucks can also produce military trucks. All Soviet automobile, truck and engine technology comes from the West, and chiefly from the United States. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks - the bulk of which came from these US-built plants.

Up to 1968 the largest motor vehicle plant in the USSR was at Gorki - and it was built by the Ford Motor Company and the Austin Company as a part of so-called "peaceful trade." The Gorki plant produced many of the trucks American pilots saw on the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The chassis for the GAZ-69 rocket launcher used against Israel was also produced there, along with the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles.

In 1968, while the Gorki plant was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and against Israel, further equipment for the plant was ordered and shipped from the US.

Also in 1968 there was the so-called "Fiat deal" - a plan to build a plant at Volgograd three times bigger than the one at Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walter Rostow told Congress and the American public this was "peaceful trade," that the Fiat plant could not produce military vehicles. However, as previously stated, *any* automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. The main design contract for the Volgograd plant was held by Fiat, whose chairman was soon-to-be Trilateral **Giovanni Agnelli**. **Agnelli** is also on the International Advisory Committee of Chase Manhattan Bank. (The IAC chairman is **Henry Kissinger**).

Fiat in Italy doesn't make automobile manufacturing equipment; they use U.S. manufactured equipment. Fiat did send 1,000 men to Russia for the erection of the plant - but over half of the equipment came from the United States, namely Gleason Works, TRW Inc. of Cleveland, U.S. Industries, Inc. and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that killed 46,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, Trilaterals doubled Soviet auto output.

In 1972, the Soviets received equipment and technology from the West to build the largest heavy truck plant in the world the Kama plant - to produce 100,000 ten-ton trucks per year - more than produced by *all* US manufacturers put together. It is also the largest plant in the world, covering over 36 square miles.

Does the Kama truck plant have military potential? The Soviets themselves answered this one. The Kama-produced truck is rated 60 per cent higher than the ZIL-130 truck, and the ZIL series trucks are standard Soviet army trucks used in Vietnam, the Middle East and Afghanistan.

In the opening paragraphs of this chapter we quoted the support from William Saunders, chairman of Ingersoll-Rand, for the Bolsheviks in 1918. Today we find the same firm Ingersoll-Rand aiding the military buildup of the Soviet Union for military equipment in use by the Soviets. According to *Business Week:*

> *"Meanwhile, a smaller but politically still more inflammatory shipment is also rolling - toward Russia's Kama River truck plant. New Jersey's Ingersoll-Rand Co. expects to complete by late this year an $8.8 million order of automated production-line equipment used to make diesel engines at the Soviet manufacturing which produced trucks used in the invasion of Afghanistan. The shipments are authorized under the Commerce Department's general licenses, not yet under strict controls."*[4]

The pro-Soviet stance of American businessmen today, as well as in 1918, is well typified by Dresser Industries. The company is now finishing a drill bit plant worth $146 million at Kuibyshev. The Soviets need high-quality drill bits to step up oil exploration, and oil is needed to fuel its overseas expansion program.

Dresser has not only continued to press ahead with the plant, but is attempting to keep its Soviet role quiet to avoid public backlash in the US. To quote Dresser's senior vice-president Edward R. Luter:

> *"Dresser is keeping a low profile on the plant. We're not looking for any publicity, because we're afraid if our name comes up, and the project is called to people's attention, they might remember that they wanted to do something to stop it. We hope we can let sleeping dogs lie, and let things continue to roll."*[5]

The reason that Dresser wants to keep its role from the public is simple: according to Department of Defense expert Dr. William Perry the Soviets "will be able to detect and monitor all US subs using oil exploration equipment sold to them by the US."[6]

KISSINGER AND SOVIET MILITARY BUILD UP

Henry Kissinger has been intimately connected for two decades with the **Rockefeller** family as a family advisor before going to Washington in 1970. In the March 1979 issue of *The Trilateral Observer* the annual cash payments from Nelson Rockefeller to **Henry Kissinger** were listed from 1958 to 1969 (**Kissinger** entered the White

House as National Security Advisor to President Nixon in 1969).[7] Each year, cash payments averaging at least $12,000 were made to **Henry Kissinger**. An official report on these transactions concluded that the payments "were for work done for the family rather than on a consulting basis through any governmental agency."[8] **Kissinger** can be described as the intellectual hired hand of the **Rockefellers**. **Kissinger** was responsible for brushing aside information that our exports to the Soviets had military potential and for forcing US government officials to approve export of equipment with military potential.

The co-author's (Sutton) personal knowledge of the role of **David Packard** (later Secretary of Defense, from 1969 to 1971) in suppressing information of military potential, and the intimate relations of **David Rockefeller** and **Henry Kissinger**, suggests that the Trilateral group was the origin of the 1970's phase to profit from the building of the military power of the Soviet Union.

Kissinger's personal role can be gleaned from documents leaked to columnist Jack Anderson, which read in part:

> *"At the time* (1972) *some officials, including then Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, voiced concern that the Russians might use the central Asian truck plant the biggest in the world - to produce military equipment.*"[9]

Kissinger brushed the misgivings aside. A confidential Commerce Department memorandum states that in 1971 **Kissinger** "ordered the Secretary of Commerce to grant three pending applications" for construction of the Soviet plant.[10] Another secret memo set the final value of US-licensed equipment and technology at $1.5 billion. Others - notably our Western European allies - were not so sure. On March 20, 1975, **Kissinger** cabled US officials in Paris on the best way to quiet such doubts. "Kama trucks are not tactical military vehicles with cross-country capabilities," the secret cable said. "Some may ultimately be outfitted with front-wheel drive for muddy or icy environment. However, trucks will not be equipped for deep fording or have other features typical of military models." **Kissinger**'s cable concluded that "we see little likelihood of diversion to military uses"[12] even though there was ample evidence on file in Washington that diversion to military uses would be made.

THE TRILATERAL VIEW OF COMMUNISM

In the light of the above material it becomes critical to know the Trilateral opinion of Communism.

In *Triangle Paper No.* 13, *Collaboration with Communist Countries in Managing Global Problems: an Examination of the Options,* we find the Trilateral view of cooperation with Communist countries.

The objective for making the report was prompted "by a desire to exploit any opportunities with the Communist countries for cooperative management of certain international problems".[13] The report did not have the objective of finding if such "cooperative management" would be advantageous to the United States or if it would enhance or reduce the security of the United States or whether it would lead to a more peaceful world. The objective *assumes* that "cooperative management" with Communist countries would be advantageous and beneficial to the United States.

On the questions of whether such cooperation would strengthen the Soviet Union, the report makes statements flatly inconsistent with well-documented fact. For example: "Some analysts have expressed concern about the consequences that are likely to flow from successful East-West collaboration in strengthening the economic capacity and therefore the international power of the Soviet Union."[14]

To which question the report answers, "These consequences are likely to be limited."[15]

ESTABLISHMENT COVER UP

Today the massive contribution of the Eastern Establishment to Soviet military development is widely known. It can no longer be suppressed as it was in the early 1970's.

Since previously "well-kept secrets" have leaked out, the new tactic is to mislead the American public into believing that it was an innocent mistake on the part of Washington policy makers. Specifically, when Jim Gallagher in the *Chicago Tribune* cites the Bryant Grinder case (precision ball bearing grinding machines were supplied to the Soviets and these machines assisted and enabled Soviet development of a family of MIRV nuclear missiles with multiple war heads) and cases where electronic equipment was converted for use in missile guidance systems he says, "In both of these cases the Soviets were able to overcome serious gaps in technology with the inadvertent assistance of the United States."[16]

"Inadvertent," indeed! Many credible and acknowledged experts were vocal in the early 1970's concerning these precise shipments and identified the exact military end uses. At the Republican Convention in Miami Beach (1972) the co-author (Sutton) explained at length how such shipments would be used by the Soviets. The shipments were not inadvertent: they were deliberate and made with the full forewarning of military end uses. In the past, warnings of the possible consequences of U.S. technological aid to the Soviets have fallen on "tuned-out" ears. As the criticism became more adamant, specific attempts were made to silence it.

So we can conclude:

1. The military build-up the Soviet Union by *some* "American" multinationals through technological transfers goes back 60 years, and today is centered in the Trilaterally represented companies.
2. The blame lies almost entirely with a few international banks and big business interests. Most important among them are Chase National (now Chase Manhattan) and the Rockefeller-influenced General Electric and RCA complexes.
3. Warnings of the expansion of the capabilities of the Soviet military inevitably resulting from American technological aid have either been ignored, suppressed or those daring to criticize have been vilified.
4. These elitist interests are the prime source of virtually every major crisis facing the United States today. Their greed and shortsightedness has placed the United States in the most precarious position in its entire history.

DAVID ROCKEFELLER AND SOVIET MILITARY POWER

There is no question that Trilaterals - **David Rockefeller** included - have been stung by repeated strong and widespread criticism of the Trilateral Commission.

At a 1980 World Affairs Council luncheon in Los Angeles, **Rockefeller** voiced concern that "Misrepresenting the motives of good and dedicated people will only narrow instead of broaden participation in the group's discussion of international affairs."[17]

Rockefeller specifically and at length denied that Trilateral multinationals deal with the Soviet Union for "the sake of financial gain." The *Wall Street Journal* excerpts from the Los Angeles speech boxed this **Rockefeller** comment to emphasize its importance:

> *"To some extremists, the Trilateral Commission is pictured as a nefarious plot by an Eastern Establishment of businessmen in the service of multinational corporations who will do almost anything including going into cahoots with the Kremlin for the sake of financial gain.* "[18]

These are strong words. The use of buzz words such as "extremists" and "nefarious" suggests an attempt is under way to cover facts with diversionary tactics.

The weak position of Trilaterals in general is reflected in their treatment of objective, factual criticism. The usual Trilateral response to *any* criticism, whether valid or not, is to label it "extremism." The critic is immediately tagged either "far right" or "far left" or, if the facts are too accurate for comfort, the critic is merely ignored.

David Rockefeller argued further:

> *"Far from being a coterie of international conspirators with designs on covertly ruling the world, the Trilateral Commission - like the Los Angeles World Affair Council -* is, in *reality,* a *group of concerned citizens interested* in *fostering greater understanding and cooperation among international allies.* "[19]

Examine the facts above and compare them to the **Rockefeller** rhetoric. The co-author (Sutton) has written five books since 1968 on the build-up of the Soviet Union by Western capitalists. Three of the books are academic in nature, published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. No one, including **David Rockefeller** and **David Packard,** has denied the factual basis of these books. The Soviets have also remained silent. They know the facts are accurate. Moreover, Commissioner **David Packard,** a Trustee of the Hoover Institution, is well aware of the Stanford books. Hoover Institution financed part of the research and in the early 1970's **Packard** was personally involved with suppressing those parts that dealt with the build-up of Soviet military power.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER FOUR

1. British War Cabinet Papers, 24/49/7197 Secret, April 24, 1918. 2.
Ibid.

3. Antony Sutton, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development* 19/7 *to 1930,* p. 290.

4. *Soviet Union Vital Goods Still Flow Despite Carter's Curbs,* Business Week, April 28, 1980, p. 42.

5. Ibid.

6. W.A. Johnson, *Daily News Digest,* July 4,1980.

7. Antony Sutton and Patrick Wood, *Influence of the Trilateral Commission- Part I,* Trilateral Observer, Vol. 2 No.3 (March 1979), p. 20. Trilateral Observer, P.O. Box 582, Scottsdale, AZ 85252.

8. *Nomination of Nelson* A. *Rockefeller of New York To Be* Vice *President of the United States,* Hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the United States Senate. 93rd Congress 2nd Session September 23, 1974), p. 883.

9. Jack Anderson, U.P., February 8,1980.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Chihiro Hosoya et ai, *Collaboration with Communist Countries* in *Managing Global Problems,* p. I.

14. Ibid. 15. Ibid.

16. Jim Gallagher, *Bryant Grinder Case,* Chicago Tribune, April 6, 1980. 17. *Letters to the Editor,* Wall Street Journal (April 30, 1980).

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

CHAPTER FIVE

ELITIST FRIENDS OF TRILATERALISM

We have previously discussed the power and membership of the Trilateral Commission, and we now need to discuss the use of this power and the influence of the Commission in a broader framework of associated elitist institutions. The Trilateral Commission does not exist in a political vacuum; it co-exists with a group of organizations which have, since about 1920, effectively taken over political power in the United States, dominated domestic and foreign policy and presently appears to be totally unrepresentative of American society as a whole.

In addition to the influence of the Trilateral Commission we have:

The Council on Foreign Relations

The Foreign Policy Association

The Atlantic Council

The Commission on Critical Choices for Americans

Together with think tanks such as Brookings Institute and Hoover Institution, these organizations constitute the source of foreign and domestic policy making in the United States. This is where ideas are generated, policies discussed, and subsequent reports written. Ideas, policies and reports are subsequently considered and discussed by all interested members of the above organizations and sooner or later a large proportion of the proposals find their way into executive decisions and/or Congressional legislation.

The overriding characteristic of this procedure is one of intellectual closed-mindedness - intellectual incest might be the best way to describe these policy creating "backwaters."

The dismal failure to create a prosperous and peaceful world during the decades-long era of American supremacy is obvious.

THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded after World War I, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) has been for fifty years the undisputed creator of American foreign policy.

As far back as 1959 the CFR was explicit about a need for world government:

> *"The U.S. must strive to build a new international order... including states labeling themselves as 'socialist'... to maintain and gradually increase the authority of the United Nations."*[1]

The site for UN headquarters in New York was donated by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., and the CFR world architects for many years tried to use the United Nations as a means to develop an image of world order. Recently the focus of world order action has shifted to the Trilateral Commission, and CFR members have complained they have lost power and prestige. *"We don't have the cutting edge we once had. We're not really in the center of things,"* stated one CFR member.[2]

The problem with the CFR is that it became too large and too diverse to act as a "cutting edge" in policy creation. With several thousand members and an internal policy of bringing in membership from a diverse geographical and racial standpoint, the CFR lost its foreign affairs expertise and prestige. Today the political action has moved from the CFR to the Trilateral Commission, as aptly described by *Newsweek:*

> *"Since the end of World War II U.S. foreign policy has been dominated largely by the circle of influential men who belong to New York's Council on Foreign Relations. From Franklin D. Roosevelt to Jimmy Carter, every President has recruited council luminaries - its membership roll is a sort of Who's Who of the Eastern Establishment elite - for high level diplomatic trouble-shooting missions or for top jobs in his Administration. But the council is not universally admired. Some outsiders view it as a kind of shadow government; others dismiss it as a private club where aging foreign-policy mandarins pontificate over tea and cookies. Both views are exaggerated, but of late even some of the council's elders have grown alarmed by a sense of their organization's waning influence. The result has been a genteel furor within the book-lined confines of the council's four-story headquarters on Park Avenue."*[3]

THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1918 a little before the CFR, the Foreign Policy Association (FPA) is a tax exempt educational organization supposedly to inform citizens on "challenges and problems of the United States foreign policy."[4] The FPA is purely an elitist organization. Out of fifty-

six board members no fewer than twenty-nine (fifty-two percent) are members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

However, only one FPA member, **Robert R. Bowie**, is a Trilateral Commissioner, so the interlock with Trilateralism is minor.

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF THE UNITED STATES

The board of directors of the Atlantic Institute is comprised as follows:

Chairman: Kenneth Rush, former Deputy Secretary of State and Ambassador to France and Germany.

Vice Chairman: Henry H. Fowler, partner, Goldman Sachs & Co. and former Secretary of the Treasury.

W. Randolph Burgess, former Under Secretary of the Treasury and Ambassador to NATO and the OEEC.

Theodore C. *Achilles,* former Counselor of the State Department and Ambassador to Peru.

Harlan Cleveland, director, Aspen Program in International Affairs, and former Ambassador to NATO.

Emilio G. *Collado,* former executive vice-president, Exxon Corporation and executive director, World Bank.

Andrew J. Goodpastor, former Supreme Allied Commander Europe.

Wm. McChesney Martin, former chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

David Packard, chairman, Hewlett-Packard Company, and former Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law, Yale University, and former Under Secretary of State.

The chairman of the Atlantic Council, Kenneth Rush, was formerly of Union Carbide Corporation. He is remembered for his actively vocal role in aiding transfer of technology with military capabilities to the Soviet Union. Union Carbide is part of the "revolving door" between Washington and the New York elite.

A vice-chairman of the Atlantic Council is **David Packard**, a prominent supporter of subsidization of the Soviet Union.

A comparison of the general directors of the Atlantic Council (not on the board) compared to the Trilateral Commission is significant.

The following 11 Atlantic Council directors are also Trilateral Commissioners.

David Packard	Vice-chairman of Atlantic Council
David M. Abshire	Director, Atlantic Council
Anne Armstrong	Former US Ambassador
Sol C. Chaikin	Trade unionist
George Franklin, Jr.	Coordinator of Trilateral Commission
Thomas L. Hughes	President, Carnegie Endowment
Henry A. Kissinger	Executive board of Trilateral Commission
Winston Lord	Chairman, Council on Foreign Relations
Charles W. Robinson	Under Secretary of State
Robert V. Roosa	Brown Brothers, Harriman
Philip H. Trezise	Former Assistant Secretary of State
Marina v.N. Whitman	Vice-president of General Motors

Also, **George Ball** is an honorary director of The Atlantic Counci1.

What are the objectives of the Atlantic Council? In its own words:

> *"The Atlantic Council, established seventeen years ago, seeks to promote closer mutually advantageous ties between Western Europe, North America, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. The objective is greater security and more effective harmonization of economic, monetary, energy and resource policies for the benefit of the individual in his personal, business, financial and other relations across national boundaries."*[6]

Then comes a key phrase:

> *"In an increasingly interdependent world where 'foreign' policy is ever more closely intertwined with 'domestic' policies there is a clear need for both official and private consideration*

of means of dealing with problems which transcend national frontiers."[7]

Note the assumption of an "increasingly interdependent world." By placing "foreign" and "domestic" in quotes, Atlanticists are clearing the way to destroy the distinction between foreign and domestic policies, a vital step in the road to a unified world under elitist control.[8]

THE COMMISSION ON CRITICAL CHOICES FOR AMERICANS

In its own words,

"The Commission on Critical Choices for Americans is a nationally representative, bipartisan group of 42 *prominent Americans, brought together under the chairmanship of Nelson A. Rockefeller. Their assignment: To identify the critical choices which will confront America as it embarks on its third century as a nation and to determine the realistic and desirable objectives this nation can achieve by* 1985 *and the year 2000.*

"Because of the complexity and interdependence of issues facing the world today, the Commission organized its work into six study panels, which emphasize the interrelationships of the critical choices rather than studying each one separately.

"The six study panels are:

Panel I -- Energy and Its Relationship to Ecology: Economics and World Stability.

Panel II -- Food, Health, World Population and Quality of Life.

Panel III -- Raw Materials, Industrial Development, Capital Formation, Employment and World Trade.

Panel IV -- International Trade and Monetary Systems, Inflation and the Relationships Among Differing Economics Systems.

Panel V -- Change, National Security and Peace, and Panel VI -- Quality of Life of Individuals and Communities in the U.S.A."[9]

In brief, the Commission is a **Rockefeller** study group funded by a **Rockefeller** organization:

"The Third Century Corporation, a New York not for-profit organization, was created to finance the work of the Commission. Since the start of its activities in the fall of 1973,

the Corporation has received contributions and pledges from individuals and from foundations well-known for their support of public interest activities. "[10]

The membership of the Commission reflects this **Rockefeller** influence:

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON CRITICAL

CHOICES FOR AMERICANS

Chairman - Nelson E. Rockefeller

Executive Director - Henry L. Diamond

Members Ex-Officio

- Gerald R. Ford
- **Henry A. Kissinger**
- George P. Shultz
- Mike Mansfield
- Hugh Scott
- Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
- John J. Rhodes

Members

- Ivan Allen, Jr.
- Martin Anderson
- Robert O. Anderson
- William O. Baker
- Daniel J. Boorstin
- Norman E. Borlaug
- Ernest L. Boyer
- Guido Calabresi
- John S. Foster, Jr.
- Luther H. Foster
- Nancy Hanks Kissinger
- Belton Kleberg Johnson
- Clarence B. Jones
- **Joseph Lane Kirkland**
- John H. Knowles, M.D.
- David S. Landes
- Mary Wells Lawrence
- **Sol M. Linowitz**
- Ed ward J. Logue

- Clare Boothe Luce
- **Paul W. McCracken**
- Daniel Patrick Moynihan
- Bess Myerson
- William S. Paley
- Russell W. Peterson
- Wilson Riles
- Laurence S. Rockefeller
- William J. Ronan
- Oscar M. Ruebhausen
- Joseph C. Swidler
- Edward Teller
- **Marina v.N. Whitman**
- Carroll L. Wilson
- George D. Woods

Of the above members an unusual number received personal gifts from Nelson Rockefeller and were consequently under some obligation to the Rockefeller family. We know of the following cases:

Henry A. Kissinger. Received a $50,000.00 gift in January 1969.

Nancy Hanks. Later married to **Henry A. Kissinger**.

Edwin J. Logue. In 1968 received a gift of $31,389 followed by another $145,000 of which $45,000 was repaid.

William J. Ronan. Received a gift of $75,000 in 1958 and $550,000 in 1974.

Henry L. Diamond. Executive Director of the Commission, received a gift of $100,000 in December 1973. [11]

ELITIST CONTROL OF U.S. POLICY MAKING

To identify precisely elitist control over independent policy research organizations, we compared the membership of the Atlantic Council, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission and the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans to find out how many members of one organization served with other organizations. (the Foreign Policy Association appears to be a special case which we will note only briefly.)

We grouped the interlocks into three categories: *Quadruple, Triple* and *Double Hats* - depending upon his/her membership in these organizations.

QUADRUPLE HATS

The Rockefeller family is represented directly in all four organizations, and also indirectly, as will be discussed later.

David Rockefeller is chairman of both the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations. The late Nelson Rockefeller was an honorary director of the Atlantic Council and created the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans. In addition, Laurence Rockefeller served on the Commission on Critical Choices.

In brief, there is direct, at-the-top **Rockefeller** family participation in all four organizations. Logically, these organizations do not reflect American society as a whole, but presumably those interests represented by the **Rockefeller** family - whatever those interests might be.

This extraordinary influence cannot be denied except by some intellectually dishonest mind "blank." Those researchers and journalists who choose to ignore this unparalleled influence over domestic and foreign policy making need to reconsider their basic moral position.

Without doubt, the influence of the **Rockefeller** family on US policy making is now and has been for many decades a topic demanding urgent and thorough investigation.

Apart from the **Rockefeller** family, the most notable "quadruple hat" is that of **Henry Kissinger.** Let's briefly look at the **Kissinger-Rockefeller** ties:

- In 1955, **Kissinger,** then an obscure Harvard professor, was chosen to head the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Objective? To develop studies to formulate American foreign policy for the 1960's. An ambitious and farsighted project; however, we are unable to determine what constitutional or moral sanction gave the **Rockefeller** family the right to determine US policy.
- Nelson Rockefeller has described **Kissinger** as a "close personal friend and associate for more than eighteen years." (1974).

- In January 1969, **Kissinger** resigned as a personal foreign policy consultant to Nelson Rockefeller and became assistant to President Nixon for national security affairs. Nelson Rockefeller presented **Kissinger** with a gift of $50,000 at that time. The gift was made in Rockefeller's own words as a token of "my affection and appreciation."
- The amount paid by Nelson Rockefeller to **Kissinger** over the period 1958 to 1968 is a matter of public record. These amounts are not unsubstantial:

1958	$3,000
1959	7,000
1960	12,000
1961	12,000
1962	12,000
1963	14,000
1964	18,000
1965	11,250
1966	9,000
1967	15,500
1968	28,000
1969	50,000

(The last gift was on joining President Nixon.)

The official report notes that these payments were for work "done for the family rather than on a consulting basis through any governmental agency."[12]

In summary, quadruple hat **Kissinger** can without prejudice be described as a hired intellectual servant of the **Rockefeller** family.

TRIPLE HATS

When we come to look at triple hats, we notice at least two interesting facts: 1) There are seven triple hats, compared to only three quadruple hats and 2) with minor exceptions, these triple hats have a Rockefeller or international banking association.

The triple hats that sit on the Trilateral Commission, Council on Foreign Relations and the Atlantic Council include: **George S. Franklin**, **Winston Lord**, **Robert Roosa**, **George Ball**, **Thomas L. Hughes**, **Charles W. Robinson** and **Philip Trezise**.

George S. Franklin was formerly coordinator of the Atlantic Council, executive director of the Council on Foreign Relations and is presently coordinator of the Trilateral Commission. Thus, in one pair of hands, there is concentrated the executive power, wielded by the secretary of a committee of three policymaking organizations. Since the Committee on Critical Choices was a temporary organization, there was no coordinating required and presumably no requirement for **George Franklin's** talents.

Winston Lord is president of the Council on Foreign Relations (**David Rockefeller** is chairman), a director of the Atlantic Council and a Trilateral Commissioner.

Robert Roosa is a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and shuttles between a partnership in Brown Brothers, Harriman (Harriman is prominent in the military buildup of the Soviet Union through US technology) and sub-cabinet posts in Washington.

George Ball is a partner in another international Wall Street banking firm - Lehman Brothers - and a long time shuttler between Washington political and banking circles.

The remaining triple hat is **Marina v. Neumann Whitman**, a former professor of economics at the University of Pittsburgh and recently a vice president at General Motors.

Apart from virtually unknown **Whitman**, the Rockefeller interests are the *only* individual interests represented on all four policy-making bodies.

We might ask how the impressive investigative powers of *The Washington Post* and the *New York Times* managed to miss such an obvious conflict of interest; or, for that matter, we might ask the same question about the *Conservative Digest.*

DOUBLE HATS

When we get to double hats, the extraordinary overlap among these organizations is identified. No less than sixty-five percent of the directors of the Atlantic Council are also members of the CFR, including its chairman Kenneth Rush, a key supporter of aid to the

Soviet Union - and all seven vice-presidents except for **David Packard**, who is a double hat on the Trilateral Commission and CFR.)

Out of eighty-two directors of the Atlantic Council, no fewer than fifty-three members of the CFR and out of twenty-four honorary directors, fourteen are also members of the CFR. That gives us a total of seventy-four members out of a total of one hundred fourteen Atlantic Council directors.

Name of Member	Atlantic Council	Council on Foreign Relations	Trilateral Commission	Commission on Critical Choices
David Abshire	X		X	
Anne Armstrong	X		X	
George Ball	X	X	X	
Sol Chaikin	X		X	
George Franklin	X	X	X	
Thomas Hughes	X	X	X	
Henry Kissinger	X	X	X	X
Winston Lord	X	X	X	
David Packard	X		X	
Charles Robinson	X	X	X	
Nelson Rockefeller	X	X		X
Robert Roosa	X	X	X	
Philip Trezise	X	X	X	
Marina v.N. Whitman	X	X	X	X

The interlock that will interest most readers is that between the traditional elitist foreign policy base (CFR) and the newer elitist vehicle, the Trilateral Commission. The authors compared the 1977-78 CRR and the 1978 Trilateral Commission membership lists.

The highlights of the interlock are as follows:

- Out of ninety-one North American Trilateral Commissioners, forty-eight (fifty-three percent) are members of the CFR. (Remember this also includes

Canadian Commissioners, so the purely US figure is closer to sixty percent.)

- When we come to the category "Former Members in Public Service," the percentage is almost unbelievable. Of eighteen Commissioners who served in Washington in the Carter administration, fifteen were members of the CFR - This is eighty-three per cent!

The three Trilateral Commissioners *not* members of CFR but who were in Washington are **Jimmy Carter**, **Walter Mondale** and **Lucy Wilson Benson**, who later became US Under-Secretary of State.

In conclusion, we can readily see the tremendous overlap in membership and control of these important policy-making organizations.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER 5

I. Study No. Seven, quoted in *Organization* #11, Network *of* Patriotic Letter writers.

2. New York Times, November 21,1971, p. 2 co!. 1.

3. Angus Deming and Tony Fuller, *Foreign Policy: Mandarins in Trouble.* Newsweek, March 28, 1977.

4. Whitney H. Shepardson, *Early History of the Council on Foreign Relations.* p. 8.

5. See information contained in footnote number 8.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. For further information, contact The Atlantic Council of the United States, 1616 H Street, NW, Washington, DC *20006* and *Report on the Foreign Policy Association* published by Doorstep Savannah, 409 East Liberty Street, Savannah, Georgia. Enclose $1.00.

9. Helen Kitchen, *Africa: From Mystery* To *Maze.* Critical Choices for Americans, Volume XI, pp v-vi.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

CHAPTER SIX:

TRILATERAL FOREIGN POLICY AND HUMAN RIGHTS: THE CASE OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Trilateral foreign policy as it was implemented in the **Carter** administration appeared to be intent on donating American assets and enterprises to the Marxist world as rapidly as public awareness will allow. This observation is not limited to this author. In fact, Vermont Royster writing in *The Wall Street Journal* made a new high for that publication, which is normally subservient to Trilateral ambitions; Royster commented on the new **Carter** agreement with Communist China:

> *"The Carter administration has agreed to normalization of relations with the People's Republic - i.e., full diplomatic recognition - on terms no different from those the Chinese would have welcomed at any time since* 1972.
>
> "*Moreover, we suddenly accepted the Chinese terms, previously rejected by Presidents Nixon and Ford, not because of any new necessity for the U.S. to normalize those relations at this time. The U.S. could have continued the existing relationship, awkward though it was, almost indefinitely without any injury to our national interests.*
>
> *"Instead we simply accepted every condition the People's Republic has demanded all along, including a formal acceptance by us, without any qualification, of the People's Republic claim that Taiwan is an integral part of Mainland China."*[1]

In short, we have one more example of the American proclivity to think that reaching an agreement is somehow more important than what's in the agreement.

Moreover, this inclination toward giving everything away is seen by Trilaterals as an imperative. Witness **Zbigniew Brzezinski** writing at the time of the Communist China debacle:

> *"And, last but not least, we have to accommodate very broadly with the People's Republic of China. It represents one-fourth of humanity, and as extremely gifted and creative*

segment of humanity, with whom we have many common interests. These interests are long-term, not tactically anti-Soviet; they are much more connected with our fundamental view of a world of diversity and not a world dominated by this or that power. "[2]

THE U.S. - COMMUNIST CHINA AGREEMENT

The Carter administration agreement with Communist China, the so-called normalization of relations, was an extraordinary treaty. All the Chinese terms, including those rejected by Presidents Nixon and Ford, were totally accepted in the Trilateral negotiations (the negotiators were all Trilaterals). On the spot in Peking was **Leonard Woodcock**. In Washington were **Cyrus Vance** and **Warren Christopher** (Under Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.)

There was no pressure to make an agreement at this time from the strategic or political viewpoint - so we must look to the multinationals for an answer. What do they gain? Is the China treaty a duplicate of the early 1920-30 Soviet agreement? A device to fill multinational order books and expand the loan base of international banks?

The United States was in an extremely strong bargaining position. The Chinese need US technology to survive and US credits to buy technology. They need the US as an ally against Russian intrusions over the Chinese border and recognition by the US gives the Chinese Communists a status they can achieve in no other way.

Yet the United States capitulated without a whimper, very much like the Vietnamese situation when the US got sucked into a major war without plan or purpose where some 50,000 Americans were killed. The battlefield was abandoned at a time when America still had the absolute capability to finish the military job. In other words, we apparently did not know why we were in Vietnam in the first place. When we *were* involved, we spent billions on war materials and even then lacked the will to use those weapons.

In this instance and others we can find a common thread, a common explanation. In science, the answer that most likely is true, is that answer which fits the largest number of cases or events. Is there profit for Wall Street in recognizing Communist China? Was there also profit in $300 billion of Vietnamese military contracts? In the same way,

there was profit in saving the Soviets and building the Soviet Five-Year Plans in the 1930's?

This is the simplest, most plausible answer. It fits the greatest number of cases - and this is where Trilateralism comes in. Trilateralism is the vehicle by which *some* banking interests and multinationals carry out their policy objectives.

The Trilateral opening to Communist China also reveals a total failure to recognize the human cost of Chinese Communism: 200 million Chinese dead in the thirty years of the Revolution. During one particular campaign, *Let a Million Flowers Bloom,* Chinese Communists lifted their restrictions on freedom of speech and action. Many Chinese then took the bait to criticize the regime. After a few months of freedom of speech the Chinese government promptly arrested the dissidents and used their own words as evidence to send them to labor camps, prisons, or to their death.

Internationalist businessmen are adept at telling each other how non-political and smart they are to ignore civil and social conditions while concentrating on the business at hand. The profit statement is the guide: hard-core amorality.

The dangerous illusions Trilaterals hold about Russia and China do not therefore stem from ignorance of the facts - their actions stem from extreme shortsightedness and amorality. An upcoming contract for a multinational corporation has total precedence over any nonsense about human rights. While, for example, Trilateral **J. Paul Austin**[3] may want to sell Coca-Cola to 800 million Chinese, Austin seems to have little interest in what happened to tens of millions of the less fortunate Chinese.

The outright betrayal of Taiwan in the clear, stark words of the official agreement reads as follows:

> *"The government of the United States of America acknowledges the Chinese position that there is but one China, and Taiwan is part of China."*[4]

It is difficult to find any historical parallel where a country has acknowledged the slaughter of 200 million people by creating an alliance with that country. Possibly the closest parallel is Hitler's alliance with Stalin in 1939 after Stalin had murdered millions of peasants and Hitler had begun to move against his enemies.

For Trilaterals, human rights are subordinate to their objective of world control. Witness the following statement:

> "*...the support for human rights will have to be balanced against other important goals of world order. Some Trilateral conceptions of detente with the Soviet Union and other communist states tend to conflict with a policy promoting human rights.*"[5]

The drive to open up Communist China as a captive market for globalist corporations has its parallel in the early days of the Soviet Union.

THE HISTORICAL PARALLEL

Many of the same companies now in China (some have since changed their names or merged with other companies) were equally responsible for rescuing the infant and collapsing Soviet Russia in 1922. In the early 1920's the Soviet Union was on the verge of collapse. The only industrial structure was that of the Czars. Industry was dormant, not destroyed as Soviet propagandists would have us believe. Foreign firms, mainly American and German, came in to start up the sleeping Czarist industry and remained to build the Five-Year Plans. Why? Because the Soviets had killed or dispersed the skilled engineers and managers needed to run industry. As Soviet Commissar Krassif phrased the problem:

> *"Anyone can help pull down a house; there are but a few who can rebuild. In Russia there happened to be far fewer than anywhere else."*[6]

Communist China today is in the same situation as Soviet Russia in the 1920's. To quote a recent statement by Chaing Ching-Kuo of Taiwan:

> *"The Chinese Communists are on the verge of collapse at this moment. The United States' establishment of relations with the Communist is to help save a bandit regime that massacres millions and millions of compatriots. Therefore, America is the biggest sinner in history.* "[7]

The same multinationals that built the Soviet Union into a vast military power are now doing the same with Communist China. China suffers from widespread electricity shortages and has had to buy Westinghouse-engineered nuclear reactors from France. The iron and

steel industry is backward and inefficient. Planned increases are based on use of Western technology, as were the Soviets' in the early 1920's and 1930's. The following table illustrates how American firms involved in the USSR - even before establishment of diplomatic relations - have also been negotiating with Communist China, and in some cases, like Coca-Cola, well before the establishment of diplomatic relations.

	Soviet Russia 1920-1930	**Communist China 1978**
Ingersoll-Rand	Represented by Armand Hammer from about 1918 onwards	Dec. 1978 order for 2 large water well drills for $1 million
Boeing Aircraft	Technical assistance	Sales of 4 jumbo jets 747-SP
Universal Oil Products	1938 contract for hydrogenation and iso-octane plants.	Petrochemical plants

Take the example of Boeing Aircraft (**T .A. Wilson** is chairman of the board). In the 1930's Boeing supplied technical assistance to the growing Soviets. The Soviet I-16 fighter was patterned on the Boeing P-26. The Soviet TU-4 four-engine bomber was a copy of the Boeing B-29 and could only have been reproduced with US assistance. Boeing is now selling to Communist China.

Another example is UOP (Universal Oil Products), now a subsidiary of Signal Oil Company. In the 1930s UOP had contracts in the USSR for construction of hydrogenation plants, which were of vital importance for military purposes. Up to 1938 the Soviets were unable to produce 87-94 octane gasoline for aviation use. Hydrogenation plants built by UOP converted 85 octane gasoline from the Saratov and Grozny refineries into 95 octane avgas. Currently, UOP is one of the first American firms in China to develop petrochemical industry - also vital for war purposes.

Yet another example is Ingersoll-Rand which was represented in the Soviet Union by Armand Hammer (now chairman of Occidental Petroleum Corporation) as early as 1918. At that time Armand Hammer's father, Julius Hammer, was secretary of the Communist Party USA. Ingersoll-Rand became a prime seller of technology to the USSR. In 1979, Ingersoll Rand is following the same road with Communist China.

Dozens of firms can be cited with similar stories. As previously noted, US multinationals built Soviet power. This has cost the United States hundreds of thousands of lives in Korea and Vietnam. Now these same multinationals have begun to build Communist China. The following table demonstrates the widespread fundamental nature of the early Chinese contracts. Apart from Coca-Cola, they involve advanced technology with outright military application.

US Firm	Work in Communist China	Comments
Coca-Cola	Monopoly of soft drinks	Chairman **J. Paul Austin** was prime Atlanta backer of **Jimmy Carter**
Control Data	12 CDC Cyber computers	$69 million
U.S. Steel	One of the world's largest ore mines	Probably over $1 billion. **Packard** and **Shepard** are directors.
Pullman, Inc.	Petrochemical facilities	Multimillion dollar
Hercules, Inc.		
UOP		
Mitsui Petro Chemical	Four petrochemical plants	$205 million (**Ikeda** is chairman and a Trilateral)
Boeing Aircraft	Three 747-SP Jumbos	$156 million (**Wilson** and **Weyerhaeuser** are directors)
LTV Corp.	Oil drilling equipment	$40 million

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK

Chase Manhattan was the first bank into Communist China and probably has the most to profit from its build-up. Back in the 1920's the forerunner of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Chase National Bank, was deeply involved in building the Soviets - some of this activity was called illegal and was certainly against US official policy.

Both Chase National and Equitable Trust were the leaders in the Soviet credit business at a time when the State Department had

specifically banned credits to Soviet Russia. Chase evaded the ban by accepting platinum from Soviet mines and advancing credit on the basis of these shipments. Again, this was strictly against US policy in the 1920's.

The president of the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce in the 1920's was Reeve Schley, also a vice-president of Chase National. The Chamber was a pressure group which sought to change US policy into recognition of the USSR and open up the Russian market for some major American firms and banks. To this end, the Chamber used known Communists as agents; for example, a Chamber delegation to Russia in 1936 was lead by Charles Haddell Smith, previously described by the State Department as "in the employ of the Soviets and a member of the Soviet Peasant International."[8] Members of the Chamber in the 1920's included many of the firms opening up the China trade today, including Deere & Co., Westinghouse and Chase National.

THE NEW CHINA POLICY IS A TRILATERAL POLICY

Some major important China contracts link to Trilateralists and their corporate affiliates are:

- The key financial backer of **Jimmy Carter** was Coca Cola chairman and Trilateral Commissioner **J. Paul Austin**, Coca-Cola will have a soft drink monopoly in China. Maybe the Chinese don't yet know what a soft drink tastes like, but 800 million Chinese are prime market for the 21st century. Coca-Cola has been negotiating for ten years with the Chinese, i.e. long before any public surfacing of a "new" China policy and presumably while the Chinese aided the killing of Americans in Vietnam.
- A consortium of US oil companies in negotiating development of Chinese petroleum resources. These include Exxon (David Rockefeller has dominant interests), Pennzoil, Phillips and Union Oil.
- Time magazine Man-of-the-Year was the Chinese Communist leader, Teng Hsiao-Ping. Trilateralist **Hedley Donovan** was editor-in-chief of Time.
- The first American banks into China were Chase Manhattan and the First National Bank of Chicago.

- Japanese Trilaterals are heavily involved in construction of Communist China - as described below.

Trilateral policy on Communist China has been spelled out clearly. Trilateral-Chinese cooperation has been proposed in the following areas, but not limited to them:

1. Earthquake warning
2. Energy: Above all, it is emphasized that China's oil potential can only be exploited by developing the offshore reserves on the continental shelf. "This would probably require outside technology. US oil companies have shown interest in investing in continental shelf oil exploration. "[9]

In brief, Trilateral publications outlined the **Carter** administration policies were later and still are being followed.

JAPANESE TRILATERALS AND CHINA

Japanese members of the Trilateral Commission reflect the Japanese establishment to an extraordinary degree. This is significant because Japan is now in the forefront of building Communist China.

The breakdown of Japanese Trilaterals is as follows:

	Trilateral Commissioners	**Executive Committee**
Business	37	1
Banks	14	3
Education	13	2
Government	5	3
Media	2	0
Unions	2	0

The previous chairman of the Japanese Trilateral Executive Committee is **Chujiro Funjino**, chairman of the Mitsubishi Corporation. Mitsubishi has contracts in China including a large contract to modernize the Shanghai shipyards, the largest in Communist China.

Three Japanese banks are represented on the Executive Committee of the Trilateral Commission: The president of the Bank of Tokyo, **Yusuka Kashiwagi** is a former special advisor to the Minister of Finance, **Saburo Okita** is president of the Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund, and **Takeshi Watanabe** is chairman of Trident International Finance, Ltd., based in Hong Kong.

Former Japanese government officials comprise more than one-third of the executive committee: **Kiichi Miyazawa** is a Minister of State and Chinese Cabinet Secretary, **Ryuji Takeuchi** is advisor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and a former ambassador to the United States and **Nobuhiko Ushiba** is also a former ambassador to the United States. Japanese trade unions have two representatives, **Kazuo Oikawa**, who is president of the Japan Telecommunications workers union and **Ichiro Shioji**, president of the Confederation of Japan Automobile workers union.

The opening up of Communist China is a vital Trilateral policy and Japanese Trilaterals are in the forefront of the rush for contracts:

- **Yoshizo Ikeda** is president of Mitsui & Co., which has numerous Chinese contracts. Mitsui Petrochemical Industries Ltd. is involved in construction of polyethylene plants.
- **Seiki Tozaki** is president of Itoh & Co., which is involved in trading contracts with Communist China.
- **Hirokichi Yoshiyama** is president of Hitachi Ltd. His firm has a $100 million contract to supply equipment for the Paoshan steelworks and will expand the Hungchi Shipyards at Luta.
- **Yoshihiro Inayama** is chairman of Nippon Steel which is also aiding development of the Communist steel industry, including a $3 billion steel plant just outside Shanghai.

In brief:

1. The current China policy is Trilateral policy.
2. The 1978 agreement was complete capitulation to Chinese Communist terms.
3. The only rational explanation for capitulation is that the power elite is focusing more on the contracts to be won than on the long-run strategic impact on our world.

THE CASE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Panama Canal Treaty handed over US property, bought and full payment made, many decades ago. The zone was under US sovereignty but handed over to a Marxist (Torrijos) regime.

Some 76% of America disapproved of the Panama treaties. Those Americans who supported the Treaties are usually described as either liberals who believe Panama is a "have not" nation more deserving of the Canal Zone or those who wish to ignore the fact of legal US ownership, although this ownership has been precisely documented to Congress.

In 1977, Congressman Robert K. Dornan identified a third group of treaty supporters - what Dornan called "the fast-money type of international banker." Dornan demonstrated that the Panama overseas debt required 39% of the Panamanian gross national product. Further, the Torrijos government was far from stable and the banks participating in this debt wanted to protect their investment. Consequently, the Panama Canal treaties gave Torrijos a much needed boost to keep his Marxist regime in power and keep the bank debt from default.

Here is an excerpt from Congressman Dornan's report to Congress:

> *"The most visible and known of this third type are the fast-money type of international banker. The Torrijos dictatorship is up to its ears in debt to banks. The debt of the Torrijos regime has now reached such proportions that* 39 *percent of the Panama GNP repeat* 39 *percent - goes to debt servicing alone. This might not cause the extreme consternation in the banking circles that it does if it were a debt owed by a stable government. But the Torrijos regime is far from stable.*
>
> *The dictator was nearly ousted a few years ago by an abortive coup and there are few wagers on his staying in power long if the treaties are rejected by the Senate. And if he is not in power, the banks do not have much chance of getting their money.*
>
> *"Some Members of Congress and Americans are aware of the conflict of interests involved in some of the banks' support of the Panamanian treaties. They are aware of the Marine Midland connection through negotiator Sol Linowitz. But there are many other banks whose endorsement of the giveaway of the canal may be motivated by monetary interests. Unlike*

Marine Midland, they have been able to keep a lower profile. They are not generally known to be part of the banking group with a lucrative stake in the ratification of the treaties. "[10]

Dornan published a list of banks participating in the Torrijos debt and also pointed out that **Sol Linowitz**, the US negotiator, was a director of Marine Midland Bank that held part of two Panamanian loans - thus establishing clear conflict of interest for **Linowitz**.

The authors examined the list of banks (thirty-one for one loan and fourteen for another loan) publicized by Congressman Dornan and traced the Trilateral links to these participating banks. The results are truly astounding. There are only three hundred Trilateral Commissioners worldwide, of which about one-third are from Japan, one-third from Europe and one third from the United States, i.e., about 90 from each region. For the two Panamanian loans cited by Congressman Dornan we found:

(1) No fewer than thirty-two Trilaterals are on the boards of the thirty-one banks participating in the Republic of Panama $115 million 10-year Eurodollar loan issued in 1972.

(2) Also, fifteen Trilaterals were on the boards of fourteen banks participating in the Republic of Panama $20 million floating rate promissory note issued in 1972.

(3) These links suggest conflict of interest on a gigantic scale, involving not only the Carter administration but the Japanese government and less importantly some European governments.

To quote Congressman Dornan again:

"But there is a third type of pro-treaty person whose motives should be impugned. These persons are well aware of the facts of the 1903 treaty and the importance of the canal to the security of the Western World. They do not endorse the treaty out of undue love of the Panamanian people or out of confusion -- they do so out of self-interest. They have something to gain from the giveaway of the American people's canal. "[11]

TRILATERAL ASSUALT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Trilateral writings on human rights is notable for its paucity. No Trilateral Task Force Report has been devoted to the basic question of individual freedoms and survival in an age of ever-increasing

government. On the contrary, Trilateral writing has focused on the rights and powers of governmental authority rather than the rights of the governed.

In the arena of public discussion and political maneuvering, some rather transparent lip service is given to human rights. Trilateralists and the Carter administration expressed a superficial "deep concern" for human rights and they convinced many that human rights are a fundamental objective of Trilateralism. For example, as proclaimed by Trilateral **Warren Christopher**, Deputy Under Secretary of State:

> *"The major accomplishment of the* [President's human rights] *policy is that we've helped to create a concern all around the world for basic human rights.*"[12]

We have to presume that **Warren Christopher** and the State Department public relations officials kept straight faces when they released that statement. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. A few examples demolish **Warren Christopher**'s expression of concern.

PROPERTY RIGHTS SUBORDINATED

In October 1977, President Carter signed the Soviet version of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Seven previous Presidents had refused to sign the Declaration because it excludes *the right to own property*. Traditional American philosophy is that without property rights there can be no "human rights."

RUSSIAN CHRISTIANS AND THE US EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

For two years a group of seven Russian Christians have been isolated in the US Embassy in Moscow - the same State Department that **Warren Christopher** says has a concern for human rights. According to Associated Press:

> *"They pray, read their Bibles, beset by fears and doubts. On one side of the room a Russian barber loudly slurs them to customers and on the other side through an iron grilled window Soviet guards occasionally shout taunts.* "[13]

Why are these Russian refugees slurred and taunted on US property?

Because US Embassy officials want them to return to the Soviets, even though they have already been granted political asylum. Why?

Because the **Carter** administration found the presence of these Russian Christians to be embarrassing. They are kept exposed to threats and taunts to "encourage" them to return to a Soviet prison rather than refuge in the US Embassy.

Comments Rev. Blakhoslav Hruby, director of the Research Center for Religion and Human Rights in Closed Societies:

> *"It's a real scandal...their refuge has become a prison... although there are thousands of worse cases of human rights violations in the world this one is particularly shameful because these people are suffering- and for so long - in U.S. hands.* "[14]

Hruby adds:

> *"The fate of these gentle, courageous, but defenseless Christians depends in a large part on how we in the West respond to their tragic predicament. There is no place for them to turn and nowhere for them to go. America* is *their last hope.*
>
> *"But the embassy seems more embarrassed by their presence than concerned. They're being treated as expendable in the name of so-called 'broader' diplomacy. But these are specific human lives and they aren't being treated like human beings.*
>
> *"Every week, embassy officials advise them to go, and they're becoming terribly depressed and discouraged. Yet if they finally give up and decide to go because they're being made so miserable, they'd be sent to Siberia to die of an 'accident'.* "[15]

This was the situation in the US Embassy in Moscow while Trilateralists **Carter** and **Christopher** pontificated to the world about human rights. And at the beginning of the Reagan administration, those Russian Christians *still* remain in captivity!

Trilateral involvement in human rights is an exercise in double standards. Some countries are criticized, some countries are not - depending on political objectives.

The double standard on human rights necessitated by Trilateralist objectives, was vividly demonstrated in 1978 by State Department spokesman John Trattner. The administration decided to return the Crown of St. Stephen to Communist Hungary after safekeeping in the

US since 1951. At a press conference, Reed Irvine of *Accuracy in Media,* Washington, D.C., pinned the administration to the wall on the double standard with dagger-like questions:

> Irvine: *The State Department is very much concerned with representative government these days. They are concerned in Rhodesia and South Africa. Are you at all concerned with whether the government of Hungary is representative of the people?*
>
> Trattner: *Our concern about representative government around the world does not also mean that we stand up here and make judgments from this podium as to the question you are asking here.*
>
> Irvine: *I see. Could you tell us when the last free election was held in Hungary?*
>
> Trattner: *I would have to go back and look at the history books. I don't really know.*
>
> Irvine: *Has Janos Kadar ever submitted himself to a free election?*
>
> Trattner: *I think what you ought to do is ask the Hungarians.*
>
> Irvine: *You know that. You know he hasn't.*
>
> Trattner: *Well, then, why do you ask the question?*
>
> Irvine: *I wanted to get the State Department's view of why they feel that this government ...*
>
> Trattner: *My answer is that from this podium we are not in the habit of making judgments on other people's governments however much we may have opinions about them and however much to you the answer may be obvious, or it may be obvious to you that I know what the answer is. On the record, up here, up here, I am not going to give an answer.*
>
> Irvine: *You don't have opinions about representative governments in Rhodesia and South Africa?*
>
> Trattner: *No, I am not saying that at all.*
>
> Irvine: *You say you are returning the crown to the Hungarian people. You are returning it to the government, to Janos Kadar, who obviously doesn't represent the people, because he*

has never submitted himself to an election. Therefore you are saying, it seems to me incorrectly, that the government of Hungary represents the people, and by this action you are indicating to everyone in the world that this government has your approbation.

Trattner: *No, I would contest that strongly. I don't think I am making that kind of statement at all.*

Irvine: *Are we getting any quid pro quo for this? Are the Hungarians doing anything - relaxing any restraints on human rights in return for this action?*

Trattner: *There are many Hungarian-Americans who have been in touch with us who have suggested that we should seek some concessions from the Hungarian government in return for the crown. Others in the Hungarian-American community have told us that because of the unique significance of the crown to all Hungarians, they feel it would be inappropriate and disrespectful to a centuries-old tradition to trade the crown for anything of that kind could possibly have an equivalent or comparable significance. We agree with the latter point of view, and recognizing that we received the crown for safekeeping without any other conditions, we stated our willingness to the Hungarian government to return it in the same manner.*

Irvine: *Could you tell us why we didn't return it much earlier then?*

Trattner: *We have always said that the return of the crown would be done in the context of an improvement in relations bilaterally, and we feel that that point has been reached.*

Irvine: *Has there been some remarkable change in the last year that would have altered...*?

Trattner: *Yes, I can cite you a few things... The overall record of Hungary in implementing the Helinsinki Final Act has been among the best in the Warsaw Pact, although its performance still falls short of Western standards.*

Irvine: *How does it compare with South Africa?*

Trattner: *I am not in the business right now, at least, of making a comparison with South Africa for you.*

Irvine: *Do they have as much freedom of the press as South Africa?*

Trattner: *I can't make a comparison for you.*

Irvine: *Do they have any freedom of the press? Are there any free newspapers in Hungary that are not run by the government?*

Trattner: *I really don't know.*

Irvine: *Could you find out?*

Trattner: *It might be possible to find out, yes* [16]

For those readers who may not know the answers evaded by the State Department, the Hungarian press is *totally* controlled by the Hungarian government, and no opposition newspapers or publications are allowed. South Africa, on the other hand, has one of the most vocal and critical presses in the world: read a few issues of the *Rand Daily Mail* or the *Cape Times* and this point is made amply clear.

IDI AMIN AND TRILATERALISM

Remember Idi Amin, the Ugandan leader, who systematically butchered his own population?

Far from Trilateral protests over Amin's butchery we find official US government support, as reported by Jack Anderson:

"With great show of disapproval, the U.S. cut off Amin's foreign aid in 1973. *Yet he flies around in grand style in a Grumman Gulfstream jet that is serviced every year at the company plant in Savannah. Georgia Page Airways, another American company, has provided flight crews to maintain Amin's imperial plane.*

We reported last fall that still another American company, Bell Helicopter, was training 20 police pilots at Fort Worth. They now operate at least nine Bell helicopters, which were sent unarmed to Uganda, but could easily have been converted into para-military aircraft.

We have now learned that the 20 pilots, who hastily returned to Uganda after our report was published, were admitted to the U.S. on A-2 priority diplomatic visas. Confidential sources say 82 *Ugandans entered the country on diplomatic visas.*

Several of them belong to Amin's notoriously brutal State Research Bureau."[17]

What is the Trilateral comment? **Warren Christopher** merely had this observation to Anderson's revelations:

"A small number of Ugandan pilots are being trained by private U.S. firms."[18]

And Jimmy Carter then handed out a weak-handed slap officially, while unofficially allowing the training of Ugandans to continue:

"We must strengthen our efforts to condemn the practices of that government. "[19]

RELEVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The Fall 1978 issue of *Trialogue,* official organ of the Trilateral Commission, was devoted to "The Politics of Human Rights."

A leadoff interview with Trilateral **Henry Kissinger** summarized the Trilateral use of human rights as a policy subordinate to other policies and a tool to be used to achieve overall objectives.

Kissinger expressed it this way in reply to a question:

Q. *What are the merits and chances of successes of a vocal human rights policy on the part of the U.S. Administration* [sic]?

A. *It has some merit for the United States to stand for its principles: the United States should definitely do so and indeed, we tried to do this also in the administrations with which I was associated. However, I think that making this a vocal objective of our foreign policy involves great dangers: You run the risk of either showing your impotence or producing revolutions in friendly countries, or both. . . I think that fundamental goals of American policy, no matter how they are defined, should be linked to other elements of interest to the Soviets. Either a policy has relevance to other areas of national strategy, or it has no meaning whatsoever. Linkage, therefore, is synonymous with overall strategic view. It is inherent in the real world, and if we ignore it, it is only at our peril.*[20]

That's it in a nutshell. "Either a policy has relevance to other areas of national strategy, or it has no meaning whatsoever." In brief, human

rights have no meaning for **Kissinger** and his Trilateral friends - human rights are gambling chips to be used as, and when, the elitists see fit.

SLAVES IN COLOMBIA

Trilaterals Over Washington, Volume I, detailed the links between some US multinationals and international banks with Trilateralism and argued that Trilateral objectives are no more than self-interested objectives for some MNC's and international bankers.

Stark evidence for this argument was revealed in 1975-6 by the use of "slave-labor-at-a-profit" by Trilateral multinationals in Colombia, Latin America. While the slave labor system is not widely known even among public officials in Colombia, it apparently has widespread use.

Under the Colombian system of law an accused person can be kept in prison without bail for periods which may extend up to ten years. About 6,000 such "prisoners," actually political detainees, work on "prison labor projects" run by corporations, including prominent US multinationals. As the knowledge of this forced labor surfaced, comments by both American residents and Colombian officials support the authors' argument on Trilateral human rights policy:

> *"It's especially bad for multinationals to do this in an underdeveloped country," said Fernando Umana, head of Colombia's only public interest law firm.*
>
> *Oscar A. Bradford, President of the Colombian/American Chamber of Commerce, hadn't heard of the practice until 1975. He commented at that time, "If I were a corporate executive, I'd be inclined to look for something a little less controversial. God knows there are enough other areas of social reform in which to apply corporate efforts and resources.* "[21]

On June 20, 1975 the *Wall Street Journal* reported this detail:

> *"Now there are plans afoot to turn the entire prison population into 'employees' of national and multinational companies. This is a proposal of Action in Colombia, a non-profit group backed financially by 70 large Colombian and U.S. concerns ranging from Avianca, the national airline, to local units of Bank of America, Dow Chemical Co. and International Business Machines Corp. So far, an Action official says, Colombian and US businessmen have responded*

'very favorably' to the plan, which is put forward as a program for rehabilitation and improvement of the prisoners' 1ot."[22]

The MNC's and banks who use slave labor in Colombia while trumpeting "human rights" to an unsuspecting American public, include Trilateral members:

- Bank of America (Trilateralist Clausen and Wood) which is backing Action in Colombia to turn "the entire prison population of Colombia into employees of national and multinational companies."[23]
- Container Corporation of America (100% owned by Mobil Oil) has operated a "slave labor" production line for many years. Container Corporation is also affiliated with Marcor Inc., another Mobil subsidiary. A Trilateralist in this group is **Robert S. Ingersoll** (First Chicago Corporation), also a trustee of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.
- Chase Manhattan owns 5.2 percent of Mobil Oil stock, and there are six Trilaterals on the Chase board. IBM is also cited as a supporter of Action in Colombia. Trilateralists on the IBM board include **W.T. Coleman, Jr.**, **William W. Scranton**, **Harold Brown**, **Carla Hills** and **Cyrus Vance**, former Secretary of State. IBM operates in Colombia through a 90%-owned subsidiary, IBM de Columbia S.A.

And note this:

"Few of the prisoners working for private companies have been convicted. Rather, they are caught up in the Colombian system of justice, in which the accused usually stays in prison until tried or until he serves time equal to the term he would have received if tried and convicted. Since bail is practically nonexistent, about 75% *of the inmates fall into this category. Some have been jailed* 8 *to 10 years without a trial.* "[24]

The slave labor program is well described by the previously cited Fernando Umana:

"This isn't a rehabilitation program at all, just window dressing for what almost amounts to slave labor. "[25]

Only time and space limit expansion on this theme of Trilateral anti-human rights activities.

TRILATERALS VS. A FREE AMERICA

Trilateralism is the creation of a group of international bankers and multinational corporations. One should not hesitate to criticize these bankers and multinationals for what they are - perverters of individual freedom, and subverters of the Constitution of the United States. But one must not mistake limited criticism of *some* bankers and *some* multinationals for an attack on *all* bankers and multinationals. It is painfully clear that *most* bankers and *most* corporations are not in the slightest involved in the end-run takeover of political power in the United States. The distinction the authors have made is between *most* bankers and businessmen (who operate more or less in a free enterprise system, and respect and want this system) and a small self-perpetuating group that has perverted the system to its own narrow and feudalistic aims.

Take a well-accepted speech by Dr. J. Kirchhoff, president of Castle & Cook Inc., that was reprinted in *Barrons.* In this speech, Kirchhoff lists the "enemies" of capitalism but omits the most important of these enemies - his capitalist peers who have subsidized and nurtured the enemies of the free enterprise system. Says Kirchhoff:

> *"Until the mid 1950's we had a good image. Capitalism could rest on its own merits. We were effective and efficient. No one quarreled with that thesis. Visible proof of its success was witnessed in a high standard of living, political freedom and unlimited economic opportunity. We had no specific five-year plan of action. We did not program the lives of others. We were free to build and to create wherever a free market existed. We were accepted or rejected based on the quality of our performance and workmanship.*
>
> *Such is not the case today: We are required to defend our very existence to a carping melodramatic 'elite minority' that produces absolutely nothing for its fellow man. Few, if any, of this elite ever developed blisters on their hands from any honest, productive labor. I personally refuse to accept the principles of this minority and I refuse to accept as part of corporate life increased government control, corporate abuse,*

terrorist attacks or other pressure which are being generated by this pseudo elite."

Apparently some church-related groups, which also happened to be supported by totalitarian capitalists, were attacking Castle and Cooke. Kirchhoff said,

"When a church related [sic] *group contributes $85,000 to terrorist revolutionaries in Rhodesia, who oppose the concept of free elections in a multi-racial society, it forfeits any immunity from criticism.* "[26]

We agree. But wait! Who are the prime supporters of these church groups who support terrorism? None other than *some* of Kirchhoffs' fellow capitalists. In fact, the speech touches on this:

"The guises frequently used are 'The New International Economic Order,' 'Alternative Economic and Social Solutions' and 'Economic Democracy.' These buzz words are palatable, at least on the surface. They are, nonetheless, the siren songs of the Marxist ideologues who have simple, uncomplicated goals: the destruction of the world's most efficient economic machine and the assumption of political power through default. "[27]

Trilateral Paper No. 14 is entitled *Towards a Renovated International System* and outlines a "global strategy" for the "New International Economic Order" castigated by Kirchhoff.

Other criticism is directed at the World Council of Churches. For example, **J. Irwin Miller** is chairman of the board of Cummins Engine (Cummins has been a prominent subsidizer of the Soviet Union) as well as a member of the central and executive committees of the World Council of Churches. The WCC regularly votes funds for Marxist-terror groups around the world. In addition, the president of Cummins Engine is Trilateral **Henry Schach**t and **William Scranton** is a director.

The World Council of Churches also has a long record of financial support from the Communist world. For example, between 1970 and 1976 East Germany contributed almost $1 million to the WCC. Holland has contributed even more than this to "The fund to combat racism." In practice, of course, the fund has nothing to do with combating racism. Black Africans were threatened with death by WCC-subsidized Marxist groups such as SWAPO, ZANU and the Pan-

African Congress: all nine black ministers in the former Rhodesian government received death threats from WCC-supported ZANU, a black Marxist-terrorist group.

This is well documented. Individual members of Western churches affiliated with the WCC must take personal responsibility for this financial support of murder.

Targeting the WCC Kirchhoff comments:

> *"We must overcome Western civilization's growing sense of guilt. There is nothing evil about profit in spite of the semantic games played by the agitators. If it were not for profit and incentive, the Western world would not be providing food, hard and soft goods, technology, services, and loans to the rest of the world...*
>
> *"The survival of truth and common decency are never certain, and must be fought for constantly. We are at war, but it is a guerilla war. It is being fought in the courtroom, the board room and the media. The enemy is organized, discernible and has ample resources.*
>
> *"Castle & Cooke does not intend, after* 127 *years, to forfeit its principles to guerrillas of any political stripe. "I am convinced that our path, rather than theirs, is the one that offers more hope for the future, but it cannot be accomplished in a vacuum or by one corporation. Let's revitalize our corporate leadership and take the offensive, in the best tradition of American capitalism.* "[28]

If American capitalists want *public* support they must first clean house. While Mr. Kirchhoff makes good sense, he needs to name names, point out responsibility and challenge **J. Irwin Miller** and his fellow revolutionaries before calling on aid from the American society at large.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER 6

1. Vermont Royster, *Orient Express,* Wall Street Journal, February 12, 1980 p. 1. 2. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Washington Star, December 31, 1978, E4.

3. J. Paul Asutin retired as president and operating officer of Coca-Cola on March I, 1981.

4. The Washington Post, December 24, 1978, p. 04.

5. Richard Cooper, et aI., *Toward a Renovated International System,* p. 30.

6. New York Times, June 12, 1921, p. 2 column 3.

7. Reported by AP (Taipei, Taiwan) December 24, 1980.

8. Antony C. Sutton, *Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917 to 1930,* p. 284.

9. Chihiro Hosoya et ai, *Collaboration with Communist Countries in Managing*

Global Problems: and Examination of the Options. .

10. Robert K. Dornan, *Banking Interests in Panama,* Congressional Record (September 15, 1977).

II. Ibid.

12. *Uneven Justice?,* Wall Street Journal, May 11, 1978, p. 1.

13. George Cornell, AP Report, Arizona Republic, March 10, 1979.

15. Ibid.

16. Reed Irvine, *Behind the News.* Accuracy In Media (1978).

17. Jack Anderson, EI Paso Times, April 27, 1978.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid.

20. Francois Sauzey, *Henry Kissinger.* Trialogue No. 19 (Fall 1978), p. 3.

21. Wall Street Journal, June 20, 1975, p.l.

22. Ibid. p. I.

23. Ibid. p. 10.

24. Ibid. p. 10.

25. Ibid., p. 25.

26. Dr. J. Kirchhoff, *Corporate Missionary: those who believe in Capitalism must fight back,* Barrons (February 19, 1979), p. 3.

27. Ibid., p. 3.

28. Op. cit., p. 3.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE PACIFIC BASIN PHENOMENON

Analysts are predicting that the 1980 Reagan presidential election will be a boon for Western states, particularly California. These claims are not unreasonable, for Reagan will naturally sympathize with Western issues much more than Carter did. Conversely, Carter clearly favored some Southern states during his administration.

But things were already shifting westward, well before Reagan and **Bush** (from the Southwest) were elected. For instance **Alden Clausen**, the chairman of San Francisco-based Bank of America, was appointed by **Carter** (with Reagan's tacit approval) to head the World Bank. Another example is Arizona Governor **Bruce Babbitt's** invitations to join the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations in mid 1980.

While traditionally Westerners have stayed aloof from the Eastern Establishment, it seems that the Eastern Establishment is moving in on the West. Western Trilaterals, notably **David Packard**, **George Weyerhaeuser**, **Caspar Weinberger** and others, have grown rapidly in national and international prominence and influence as a result of this transition.

There is a reason for this shift in power, and as always, it is related to economic trade and profits.

In 1979 the dollar amount of US trade with Pacific Basin countries outstripped trade done with Atlantic nations. (This refers to the countries that border the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, respectively.) One major reason for this is the rapidly expanding Japanese economy; for instance, Japan recently surpassed the US in auto production. The boom in the electronics industry in Taiwan, Korea and other oriental countries is also expanding every month.

To multinational elitists, the hope of the future lies in Mainland (Communist) China, with its 800 million population and virtual slave labor market. There is interest in selling goods and services to the Chinese population, of course, but the potential for making goods in China for export to the rest of the world is overwhelming. Low cost department stores in the US are already carrying Chinese made textile goods that are priced thirty per cent or more *below* any other brands.

China will be a profit bonanza for the multinationals, but a depression for American labor forces who cannot possibly compete with the Chinese wage market. Indeed, China proves to become the great "equalizer" between the "haves" and "have-nots" in the world.

International interest is high also. In February 1980 *Business Week* reported:

> *"Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira is being urged by some of his liberal, English-speaking advisors to take the initiative in setting up a Pacific Community, modeled on the European Economic Community... The Japanese, enthusiastic about the Pacific Community idea, have set up a meeting in Canberra, Australia, this fall to discuss the project. "*[1]

In May 1980, one of the first steps in that direction took place with the response of the Pacific Basin Economic Council (which met in Australia) to a proposed think tank. On May 15, 1980, the *Arizona Republic* reported the following story which was not seen elsewhere. It quoted a prospectus of that planned think tank, the Pacific Basin Institute:

> *"'The Pacific Basin Institute will be a private, nonprofit research center serving as a focal point for the business communities of North America, South America and Asia, with special emphasis on applied studies concerning trade, investment and economic development in the Pacific Region.*
>
> *"'PBI is strategically located in Arizona, which borders Mexico and is the center of the most dynamic growth area in the United States.*
>
> *"'The Southwestern site offers easy accessibility for Pacific Basin leaders of business, government and education to come together in an ideal climate with excellent resorts and meeting facilities.'*
>
> *"The proposed research center is the brainchild of Mallery, who refused to comment on the results of the trip to Australia.*
>
> *"Gov. Bruce Babbitt, who said Phoenix business and government leaders have been working intensively on the idea for a year, said the prospects of the research center becoming a reality look favorable.*

> "'*Arizona must get into the arena of international trade on a large scale,' he* **[Babbitt]** *said. 'It must have the academic and research capacity to underpin that kind of effort. That's what this is all about.*
>
> "'*The underlying philosophy behind the concept is to look at the Pacific Basin region for data gathering and economic decision-making in partnership with business and government,' he said.*
>
> *"The prospectus says a site for the center 'has been donated and sufficient financing has been committed to construct and operate the facility.'*
>
> "*...The prospectus says the business activity and financial affairs of the institute would be directed by a board of trustees made up of* 45 *persons 'who hold business, government and academic positions is throughout the Pacific region.'* "

This sounds similar to many other elite organizations that desire to make decisions for the rest of the world, but would be of little consequence if the people involved were of little consequence.

The others involved with PBI were revealed in the same article:

> *"The Pacific Basin Economic Council, a federation of private-sector businessmen representing 20 countries, including Canada, Japan, China and New Zealand, met in Sydney, Australia, last week and responded 'very positively' to the concept, said Larry Landry, director of the state* [Arizona] *Office of Economic Planning and Development.*
>
> *"Landry, along with Phoenix lawyer Richard Mallery and Roger Lyon, president of Valley National Bank, went to Australia last week to gain acceptance of the proposed Pacific Basin Institute...*[2]

The four principals here are Larry Landry, Richard Mallery, Roger Lyon and **Bruce Babbitt**.

Arizona Governor **Bruce Babbitt**'s appointment to the Trilateral Commission coincided with the announcement of PBI. **Babbitt** is an old-line Arizona Democrat with direct ties to Washington. He received his degree from Harvard Law School, but only after receiving an advanced degree in geology. He was the only public official appointed by **Carter** to the Kemeny Commission (which investigated the Three

Mile Island Incident) and later **Carter** named him to chair the Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee on May 7, 1979.

As head of the Arizona Office of Economic Planning and Development Department, Larry Landry serves directly under **Babbitt**.

Richard Mallery is part of **Babbitt**'s tight-knit "Kitchen Cabinet", all of whom were classmates at Harvard. Mallery is described by the March 2, 1980 *Arizona Republic* as" A partner in the prestigious Snell and Wilmer law firm. . . shuns active involvement in the Democratic Party. He is viewed as non-partisan, moves well in both party circles and is more concerned about issues than party dogma."[3]

Roger A. Lyon however, reveals the most interesting back ground. Lyon is president of Valley National Bank of Arizona, the 28th largest bank in the country and the largest in the Rocky Mountain Region. The largest individual shareholder in VNB is investment banker J.P. Morgan & Co. of New York, with a whopping 4.2% of VNB's outstanding shares.

In late 1980, Lyon was elected to serve as chairman of the powerful Western Regional Council, which represents "40 of the largest corporations, banks, utilities and other businesses in the Western States," according to the *Arizona Republic*. Lyon had this to say about Western regional interests:

> *"We are different from the east...in water, clean air, our vistas, national parks, wildernesses, recreation we have different values and standards. We have to convince Washington and the rest of the country of that.* "[4]

Few asked how Lyon happened to come to Arizona. From 1950 to 1976 (26 years), Lyon served at **David Rockefeller**'s Chase Manhattan Bank in New York! Lyon is the third generation of a banking family from New Jersey.

It would appear that Lyon has renounced the East for the sake of Western living, but one might remember the old proverb about a leopard changing its spots.

After analyzing the people who promoted Pacific Basin Institute through the Australian conference, we can see a heavyweight connection to the Trilateral elite and a typical modus operandi. PBI will have a membership similar to the Trilateral Commission: academics, politicians and multinational corporation "heads of state." Its goal appears similar as well: to foster economic cooperation and trade.

Certainly Pacific Basin Institute is neither a copy nor replacement of the Trilateral Commission. Far from it. More likely it is the result of the same Trilateral policy that opened China up in the first place. Remember, *all* five of the original China negotiators (who worked in secret and included Carter), were current or former members of the Trilateral Commission. China is exclusively a Trilateral phenomenon.

Pacific Basin Institute is seen to be the natural extension of that phenomenon. It is certainly something to watch in the future.

It should also be noted at this point that it was very difficult in obtaining information regarding PBI. Governor **Babbitt's** office was totally uncooperative and gave us no information. In fact, after his T.C. appointment was made public in 1980 by the Commission itself, **Babbitt** received so much harsh criticism from Arizonans that his staff responded to callers with "I have no personal knowledge of that." This is a standard dodge when a politician doesn't want to answer the question; they now acknowledge his membership.

Valley National Bank and Roger Lyon's office have also been wholly uncooperative in releasing information on PBI. When asked for a "history sheet" on Lyon (a customary handout for top corporate executives, his aide became defensive and refused to release *any* information.

A contact was made with the Japanese embassy in Washington, D.C., who acknowledged that they had information on PBI. While they had originally agreed to send us information, after two months and two more phone calls, nothing was received.

Finally, after contact with Richard Mallery's office, the prospectus for PBI was obtained. According to that report, Mallery is president of PBI and Lyon is chairman of the board.

There is a substantial link to Stanford University: Weldon B. Gibson is vice-chairman of the board and is executive vice president of SRI International (Stanford Research Institute). Trilateral **Arjay Miller** is a director of SRI International. Philip Habib, a senior fellow at Hoover Institution at Stanford is vice president of PBI.

Acknowledgements and thanks were given to heavyweights like **Winston Lord,** president of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Robert Macy, Jr., managing director of Lehman Brothers, Kuhn Loeb.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The West is rapidly growing in Trilateral influence. The election of Reagan and **Bush** will accelerate this trend.
- As China's manufacturing capacity is brought on line by Trilateral multinational corporations, America (and the rest of the world) will be flooded with noncompetitively priced goods.
- American labor will feel the biggest brunt of this and will lose countless jobs at the expense of Chinese slave labor.
- The Pacific Basin Institute is the main instrument that will be used by the Trilateral elite to coordinate the Pacific Basin and to devise and recommend "policies" for participating countries in the Basin.
-

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Maryanne McNellis, *Japan's Push for a Pacific Community,* Business Week (February 25, 1980), p. 72.

2. Joel Nilsson, *Pacific Region Businessmen Back Idea of State-Based Trade Institute,* Arizona Republic (May 15, 1980), p. A-I.

3. *Richard Mallery: Bridge to the business community,* Arizona Republic (March 2, 1980), P. A-I.

4. J.J. Casserly, *Bank Chief to Lead Regional Council,* Arizona Republic (December 6 , 1980).

CHAPTER EIGHT

BACKWARD AND FORWARD

At this point we should step back and look at the Trilateral Commission in the light of history. The Commission represents the third attempt by the New York international banking fraternity to create a New Economic World Order under their control. When we look at this third attempt within the context of history, it is clear why the Commission (or its equivalent) will continue.

THE ORIGINS OF GLOBALISM

It was Thomas Jefferson, writer and signer of the Declaration of Independence who first warned a newly independent America about the powers behind the scenes of government:

> *"If the American people ever allowed the banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers occupied. The issuing power of money should be taken from the banks and restored to Congress and the people to whom it belongs.*
>
> *"I sincerely believe the banking institutions are more dangerous to liberty than standing armies."*[1]

The "banking institutions" are represented today by Trilateralism. What was true in 1790 is true in 1980.

Out of seventy-seven Trilateral Commissioners from the U.S., well over one-half are either directors of banks, or have been directors of the Federal Reserve System (which is owned and controlled by private banks). We also must recall that **David Rockefeller**, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, founded the Trilateral Commission.

To follow through on Thomas Jefferson's prophetic warning, "the American people" have not merely allowed "banks to control the issuance of their currency," but almost unbelievably they have allowed banking interests to control the domestic and foreign policies of the United States.

ATTEMPT #1: THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The formal attempt to extend control of the United States to the world was the League of Nations. The idea for the League of Nations came from Cecil Rhodes' Round Table groups and was proposed to Woodrow Wilson at least as early as September 1915 by Sir Edward Grey, a member of the Round Table, in a letter to Colonel M. House:

> "*Would the President propose that there should be a League of Nations binding themselves to side against any power which broke a treaty.*"[2]

What went wrong with the League of Nations? Elitists blame the failure on Woodrow Wilson. For example, elitist academic Harlan Cleveland wrote:

> *"The first try, the League of Nations, was the product of Woodrow Wilson's strong initiative and the victim of his weak follow through: the United States wrote most of the club rules, then decided not to join the club. In its weakened condition, it could not survive the rise of fascism, Nazism and militarism."*[3]

This statement is typical of elitist evasion and distortion of truth. Cleveland makes at least the following errors:

- The League did not survive Hitler to be sure, but who financed and nurtured Hitler? None other than key members of the Council on Foreign Relations, the successor to the Inquiry which promoted the League. (See Antony Sutton, *Wall Street and The Rise of Hitler.)*
- Cleveland does not mention that the rise of Communism was also financed and nurtured by the same key members of the Council on Foreign Relations. (See Antony Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution.)*
- It is more valid to argue that the first try at New Economic World Order failed because the "club" saw more profit (both financially and for the goal of New Economic World Order) in the Second World War. This aspect of world history has to be buried because it would highlight the amoral character of elitists.

ATTEMPT #2: THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

In New York, July 29, 1921, the elite founded a semi-secret organization called The Council on Foreign Relations. The CFR evolved out of the American Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, which later merged with the American Branch of the British Institute of International Affairs. This culminated with the formation of the United Nations. The report of the founding committee for the CFR contained the following statement of purpose:

> *"Until recent years it was usual to assume that in foreign affairs each government must think mainly, if not entirely, of the interests of its own people. In founding the League of Nations the allied powers have now recognized that national policies ought to be framed with an eye to the welfare of society at large."*[4]

Here we have precisely the same globalist objective to be found in the Trilateral Commission today.

What is important is the makeup of the board of directors of the Council on Foreign Relations during the 1920's and 1930's. It was dominated, as is the Trilateral Commission, by Wall Street banking interests.

Prominent among the early directors was Paul M. Warburg, partner in the firm of Kuhn-Loeb and the first member appointed by Woodrow Wilson to the Federal Reserve Board. In fact, Warburg was the brains behind the Federal Reserve System. Warburg was also chairman of the International Acceptance Bank, Inc. and (much less known) a director of American I.G. Chemical Corporation which was the American branch of I.G. Farben that had so much to do with the rise of Hitler.

In the Trilateral Commission today we find Kuhn-Loeb and the Federal Reserve System well represented. **Charles W. Robinson**, former managing director of Kuhn-Loeb, was in the **Carter** administration. Links between Trilateralism and Federal Reserve System include **Arthur F. Burns**, **Andrew Brimmer**, **David Rockefeller**, **Paul Volcker**, **Bruce K. MacLaur**y, **Alden Clausen** and **Robert V. Roosa**.

Another Wall Street financier on the board of the CFR was Otto H. Kahn. Like Paul Warburg, Kahn was a former partner in the private banking company of Kuhn-Loeb. Russell C. Leffingwell was a director

of the Council on Foreign Relations during the inter-war years. In 1919 he held the office of Secretary of the Treasury and had been in partnership with J.P. Morgan and Company.

Another director of the CFR was Owen D. Young, chairman of General Electric Company (which was dominated by the J.P. Morgan interests) and the German Reparations Committee (which drew up the so-called Young Plan). CFR director Allan W. Dulles served during the inter-war period. During the same time, Dulles was also a director of J. Henry Schroeder Banking Corporation and a partner in the establishment law firm of Solomon and Cromwell. It is recorded that the J. Henry Schroeder Banking firm was one of the key elements behind the rise of Hitler in Germany.

Another inter-war director of the CFR was Norman H. Davis. According to Quigley, Davis was a "non-legal agent of the Morgans."[5] He had represented the US Treasury on the Paris Peace Delegation. Woodrow Wilson himself owed his 1913 financial backing for the Presidency to his "classmate and life long friend." Cleveland Hoadley Dodge was a director of National City Bank and the Russell Sage Foundation.

The CFR exerted its major influence during the period from 1940 through the mid 1960's, and its members reflected almost all of the establishment leaders particularly people like Wall Street banker John J. McCloy, John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles and so on. The high point of the CFR undoubtedly was the creation of the United Nations. John D. Rockefeller, Sr. donated the New York site and was instrumental in getting the United Nations off the ground in San Francisco in 1945.

At the height of CFR powers in 1971, a dispute over the editor of the Council's quarterly *Foreign Affairs* magazine marked the end of the second attempt for new world order. Under President Bayless Manning, a former dean of the Stanford Law School, the CFR tried to broaden its membership from a geographical, age, racial and sexual standpoint. By the 1970's the CFR had sixty women and twenty-two blacks on its rolls; but these new members were not selected as carefully as in the past and the expertise and prestige traditionally associated with the CFR was diluted. When Manning attempted to appoint William P. Bundy to the editorship of *Foreign Affairs*, he (Manning) was eased out of the CFR presidency by **David Rockefeller**.

ATTEMPT #3: TRILATERALISM

In 1973 the third attempt at new world order came under the guise of the Trilateral Commission. It had different short- and medium-term objectives than both the League of Nations and United Nations.

Trilateralism abandons the concept of bringing together nations into a *political* world society in one giant step. Instead, it proposes to first create regional economic groupings and then link the three most important of these regional groupings (North America, Europe and Japan) into a *new economic world order*. The discussion and policy-making steps necessary for this objective are known as the "Trilateral process." Incorporation of Communist societies and the Third World is desired but is left for a more distant date.

In brief, Trilaterals are more pragmatic than their CFR allies in the United Nations and the League of Nations.

Even this limited Trilateral objective has major problems, not least of which is that it requires abandonment of American independence and national sovereignty.

It is no surprise to find Trilaterals eager to change the Constitution into a document more malleable to their ends. *Volume I* quoted **Brzezinski's** statement *(Between Two Ages,* p. 258):

> *"Either* 1976 *or* 1989 - *the two-hundredth anniversary of the Constitution - could serve as a suitable target date for culminating a national dialogue on the relevance of existing arrangements. . ."*[6]

The Trilateral Commission's New Economic World Order is impossible as long as the Constitution exists in its present form. More dictatorial powers are needed to function as revealed in an official Commission report:

> *"If a more effective and equitable economic order is to emerge, national policies and programs must be subject to moderation and adjustment to take into account probable adverse international ramifications. This can be accomplished only if powerful domestic agencies are brought under control and sensitized to the international consequences of their policies."*[7]

The Trilateral Commission here proposes that our domestic policies be subordinated to international policies.

In *The Crisis of Democracy* (funded and written by the Trilateral Commission) evidence is found that Trilaterals need to restrict Constitutional freedoms. For example, the right to free speech is protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution. Yet the following concerning freedom of the press is found:

> "*... it is a freedom which can be abused... the responsibility of the press should now be increased to be commensurate with its power, significant measures are required to restore an appropriate balance between the press, the governments and other institutions in society.* "[8]

How does the Commission propose to do this?

> "*...beginning with the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act measures had to be taken to regulate the new industrial centers of power and define their relations to the rest of society. Something comparable appears to be now needed with respect to the media."*[9]

Of course, monopoly of industry and commerce is not the same as freedom of speech. The break-up of monopoly cannot in any way be compared to restrictions on expressions of ideas. It is a logical absurdity, yet an excellent example of Trilateral use of non sequiturs.

THE 1980's PROJECT

Continuation of the Trilateral Commission is almost a foregone conclusion. The Trilateral process is simply another attempt in almost 100 years of new world order plans.

There are subtle but important changes in Trilateralism to be noted. Not only is the immediate objective limited to regional groupings but the Trilateral program is carefully balanced on two key hinges:

a. That a New Economic World Order is inevitable. For example, "The management of interdependence has become indispensable for world order in the coming years. Its origins lie in the extraordinary expansion of interaction between modern states and societies."[10]

b. That the objective can be attained through propaganda techniques. To this end, almost endless studies and reports are published assuming that the New Economic World order is inevitable for the survival of mankind. This assumption is critical because it has no basis in fact.

It is notable that the major propaganda effort is still centered within the Council on Foreign Relations i.e., the 1980's Project. But the clue to Trilateral involvement is their dominance of the CFR Committee on Studies responsible for the 1980's Project.

So far, the project consists of twenty-five volumes released by McGraw-Hill. They lay down the "steering trends" to new world order in the 1980's. Of the ten members of the CFR Committee on Studies, four were Trilaterals (**Kissinger**, **Volcker**, **Whitman**, **Perkins**). The chairman was **Perkins**. **Kissinger** and **Volcker** dominated the other members (pedestrian academics without fame or notoriety).

TRILATERAL MONEY MANAGEMENT

No doubt by this time readers will have grasped the fundamental observation that the Trilateral New Economic World Order is intended for the private benefit of Trilateral Commissioners at the expense of everyone else. This is the secret of monopoly, possibly age old, but certainly rediscovered by the Rockefeller-Morgan financial elite at the end of the 19th century.

Trilaterals are just following the golden rule of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. and John Pierpoint Morgan: *gain political power and use it for financial objectives.*

If this is the fundamental Trilateral rule, what can be said about the future of our society? Specifically on monetary affairs, the following can be projected:

- A fiat currency. This is absolutely essential for the New Economic World Order, and must be coupled with international fiat "reserve" assets.
- Gold will continue to be centralized into a few hands. Gold in the hands of the many is out of the question if Trilateralism is to succeed. As gold provides for personal economic sovereignty, it must be retained in the hands of the elitist few and directly or indirectly be controlled.

The Treasury campaign to demonetize gold, formerly led by Trilateral W. Michael Blumenthal, is an admission that Trilaterals are having problems in this segment of their program.

Gold has been removed from our monetary system in order to remove the shackles from "management" (manipulation) of the monetary system for elitist objectives. This policy was begun by Franklin D.

Roosevelt in 1933 and it must not be forgotten that Roosevelt himself, far from being a man of the people, came from the old established banking family that created the Bank of New York in 1784.

The Repeal of the 1933 *Joint Resolution* by Congress in 1974 has allowed American citizens to privately own gold, but was coupled with a Treasury program to sell gold and depress its price. Under US dominance, the International Monetary Fund joined in the gold-selling campaign. These selling pressures temporarily held down the price of gold.

Crisis management (or problem management) is an essential Trilateral tool to build a New Economic World Order. Problems do not exist to be solved or ameliorated. Problems exist to exasperate, knowingly or unknowingly, in order to advance basic world order objectives.

Monetary management is no exception. Trilateralist proposals for monetary management will not solve the questions of inflation, federal intervention, burdensome taxation, interest rates or any other matter.

One may be justified in thinking that academic experts in the Trilateral Commission are chosen because their "solutions" coincide with the objectives of the power elite. An excellent example is found in the views of **Gardner Ackley** who is a member of the Commission as well as having held the position of professor of political economy at Henry Carter University and the University of Michigan. An interview with **Ackley** presents **Ackley** as a valuable asset for Trilateralism. His proposals advance New Economic World Order objectives:

> *"There are many occasions in which deficits are appropriate and necessary. . . There are many occasions in which deficits are unavoidable. "*[11]

THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Trilateralism was heavily represented in every major political campaign in 1980. **John Anderson** - running on an independent ticket - was a member of the Commission and was duly financed by many individual fellow members. **Jimmy Carter** and **Walter Mondale** both had definite connections with the Commission.

While Ronald Reagan was not a member of the Trilateral Commission, many of his top campaign advisors were. We want to demonstrate how Trilateralism "covered all the bets" in the political

arena, and how its resulting influence on Ronald Reagan - the victor - will all but guarantee the success of their New Economic World Order plans.

By the time the Republican National Convention met to nominate a candidate, Ronald Reagan had no serious rival. Excitement was high because for the first time in a long time there was a unified party. Senator Barry Goldwater delivered a well-cheered speech stating the dangers of elitist influence in government - he also said that this might be the last election America faces.

Goldwater's recent book, *With No Apologies,* devotes an entire chapter to the Trilateral Commission. Without judging his intent, we can safely say that Goldwater well understands the Trilateral Commission and its goals.

Goldwater's speech was cheered but his warnings were ignored. After the convention forcefully rejected **Kissinger**'s proposal for a "split Presidency" (with **Kissinger** being the "other" president), it turned right around and nominated Trilateral **George Bush** for Reagan's vice-presidential running mate.

After this, many prominent and hopeful conservatives "counseled" the authors that Reagan was not connected to the Trilaterals and would "use" anything or anybody he could to get elected. In the Trilaterals' case, it was OK because Reagan would quickly dispense with them once he was elected.

One of the largest pro-Reagan forces in the country was Moral Majority, a quasi-Christian political action group originally brainstormed by Paul Weyrich in Washington. Other groups like Moral Majority (Round Table and Christian Voice, for example) were wooed by Reagan in typical political fashion.

After the election, millions of Americans (many of whom *are* fundamental Christians) were looking to Reagan to support their positions. But the November 24 issue of *U.S. News* & *World Report* revealed the hard reality:

> *"Top officials of the Reagan team have sent a message to the Moral Majority: 'It isn't your administration.' These advisers to the President-elect are urging him to ignore political threats of punishment by the religious right if he does not support their policies.* "[12]

The article went on to say:

> *"Reagan's first moves after the November 4 election generally pleased moderate Republicans and Democrats, some of whom feared he would follow the dictates of his most conservative supporters. 'Hell with them,' Vice President-elect George Bush declared on November 10 in Houston, referring to right-wing groups that supported the President-elect."*[13]

In perspective then one must ask, "Who is going to throw whom out of where?"

America had bought the "anti-elitist" story once more, like they did with CFR member Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1934 and Trilateral **Jimmy Carter** in 1976. The facts cannot be ignored: Reagan's campaign was engineered and operated by Trilaterals **David Packard**, **George Weyerhaeuser**, **Bill Brock**, **Anne Armstrong** and **Caspar Weinberger**, and a large assortment of CFR members, Reagan was personally supported by **David Rockefeller**.

WILL THE REAL REAGAN PLEASE STAND UP?

On November 6, 1980, the following Reagan quote was widely reported in the nation's press:

> *"I think there is an elite in this country and they are the very ones who run an elitist government. They want a government by a handful of people because they don't believe the people themselves can run their lives...Are we going to have an elitist government that makes decisions for peoples' lives, or are we going to believe as we have for so many decades, that the people can make these decisions for themselves?"*[14]

Reagan certainly cannot claim ignorance of the scope and influence of the Trilateral Commission. Indeed, he has been rubbing elbows with the Eastern elite for many years as a member of the exclusive male-only Bohemian Grove Club in Northern California.

The San Mateo Times quoted Irving Stone, the author of *The Origin* - a biographical novel of evolutionist Charles Darwin - and an ardent evolutionist. In light of Reagan's wooing non-evolutionists (i.e., the before-mentioned 'fundamental groups) during the campaign, Stone's comments serves as another warning that things might not be as they appear.

> *"I've known Ronald Reagan for 35 years. He's a very' warm, personable man. But Ronnie doesn't have the mind to make*

independent judgments... he has to have a script which he will memorize perfectly.

"I'm a little frightened to have a man in the Oval Office who can't make independent judgments...

When he made that statement about evolution in Houston, he was talking to a large crowd of Fundamentalists. Apparently, he wants their votes very badly. "[15]

After the election, Reagan assembled a "transition team" which would later select, screen and recommend appointees for major administration posts. According to a compilation by *Research Publications* of Phoenix, of the fifty-nine people Reagan named to that team, twenty-eight were members of the CFR, ten belonged to the secret and elite Bilderberger group, and no less than ten were Trilaterals.

There are two particular "brain trusts" that will fuel Reagan's foreign policy. The first is Stanford University's Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace in Palo Alto, California. The other is Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C. Almost forty of the total transition team had been associated with one or the other of these "think tanks." Reportedly, fifteen of Reagan's advisors came from CSIS. (**Henry Kissinger** is a professor at CSIS, for instance.)

The chairman of CSIS is Trilateral **David M. Abshire**, who also headed Reagan's foreign policy and defense transition staff.

David Packard is the most influential overseer at the Hoover Institution at Stanford.

In short, the reader can see that regardless of good intentions or wishful thinking, Reagan appears to be totally consumed by Trilaterals. This is the Trilateral way of political "protection." A Reagan-**Bush** administration will result in further progress for Trilaterals toward their New Economic WorId Order:

- Reagan will stress business and economics, and "business" is the Trilaterals' expertise.
- The new Republican majority Senate will be very cooperative with the administration as far as an economic policy is concerned.

- Under Democratic control, Trilateral headway was stagnating; it has a "fresh start" with Republican control. Here we apply the principle that a ship will not respond to rudder control unless substantial movement is present.

Looking to the next ten years in light of the last sixty years does not promise anything but "business as usual." The same type of elite groups that dominated in the 1920's *are* dominating today. They are moving forward today with no less resolve than they were then. And prospects for their success never looked brighter.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER EIGHT

1. Thomas Jefferson, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* (Autobiography, correspondence, reports messages addresses and other writings.) vol. 7, p. 685.

2. Jennings C. Wise, *Woodrow Wilson: Disciple of Revolution,* p. 382.

3. Harlan Cleveland, *The Third Try at World Order,* p. 2.

4. Whitney H. Shepardson, *Early History of the Council on Foreign Relations,* p. 3.

5. Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope,* p. 50.

6. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era,* p.258.

7. Egidio Ortona and et.al., *The Problem of International Consulations,* p. 17.

8. Michael Crozier and et.al., *The Crisis of Democracy,* p. 18!.

9. Ibid., p. 182.

10. Richard Cooper and et.al., *Toward a Renovated International System,* p. 4.

11. *A Constitutional Ban On Red Ink?,* U.S. News & World Report, January 29, 1979, p.27.

12. *Washington Whispers,* U.S. News & World Report vol. LXXXIX No. 21 (November 24, (980), p. 20.

13. Ibid., p. 22.

14. San Jose Mercury, November 6, 1980.

15. San Mateo Times, October 16, 1980.

CHAPTER NINE

TRILATERALISM IN EUROPE

Trilateralism, as its name suggests, is a three-sided affair:

(a) The United States

(b) Japan

(c) Western Europe (excluding Austria, Greece, and Sweden)

This area includes eighty percent of the economic power in the non-Communist world and is the source of virtually all of the world's new technology.

The basic Trilateral concept is to link the three economic power areas in the world into a united international force. US dominance would mean Rockefeller-Chase Manhattan dominance because Trilateralism was created by **David Rockefeller** and continues to be dominated by him.

The European segment of the Commission shares the same goals for a New Economic World Order, but they would envision themselves as the ultimate dominating factor (likewise for the Japanese Trilaterals).

The political gaps in Trilateral distribution are more than noticeable. Africa is not included. Neither is the Far East, Latin America or Australasia.

Trilaterals want to build a unified Trilateral force, then draw in the last named areas on a piecemeal basis. Africa (apart from South Africa) is undeveloped and contributes talk rather than power. The Far East is a complex emerging economic force. Australasia is not powerful in global terms.

Latin America includes some powerful countries (Brazil; Argentina and Mexico) - yet is ignored because the Latin cultural tradition has kept Latin leaders aware of Chase Manhattan-**Rockefeller** activities. In general, Europe has a residue of gratitude for World War II, while Latin America has a long standing cultural antipathy towards anything smacking of international banking operators: Catholic bankers, for instance, are bound by religious precepts to lend money for productive purpose only. New York bankers use money and debt for political control.

Each Trilateral area has a chairman and a deputy chairman. **David Rockefeller** is North American chairman and **Mitchell Sharp** of Canada is North American deputy chairman.

Europeans hold these positions for their Trilateral side:

Georges Berthoin is European chairman

Egidio Ortona is European deputy chairman

Berthoin is president of the European Movement and one time aide to Jean Monnet, father of "One Europe." **Egidio Ortona** is president of Honeywell Information Systems, Italia, which is closely linked to Trilateral **Edson W. Spencer**, president of Honeywell in the US.

The geographical distribution of Trilateralists in Europe is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Country	Trilateral Commissioners	Executive Committee Members	Number in Public Service
United Kingdom	26	2	2
W. Germany	21	3	2
France	18	3	4
Italy	14	3	2
Eire (Ireland)	7	1	2
Norway	3	1	1
Netherlands	6	1	0
Denmark	3	1	2
Spain	12	2	0
Portugal	3	0	0
Total	**114**	**17**	**15**

TRILATERALISM AND "ONE EUROPE"

The link between "One Europe," or a United States of Europe and Trilateralism is important. To move from three regional groupings to "One World" requires that each region be cohesive and unified. (Authors' note: "One Europe" is an established term created by the people associated with it. "One World" is the authors' coinage to

compare and describe the larger concept.) This is impossible with the current state of the United Nations. It is much more plausible in the Trilateral process.

US-Trilateral intent is to build "One Europe" to be merged into a global society. Oddly, this is not the view from Europe, which sees "One Europe" as a final goal. Wall Street sees "One Europe" as a stepping stone to One World.

When links between the European Economic Community (EEC) and Trilaterals are described, the step by step movement towards One World becomes apparent.

There may well be economic arguments for reducing European customs barriers to encourage free trade. But European political disadvantages have been obscured by more superficial economic benefits. To avoid sinking into the Trilateral morass, Europe will have to restrict cooperation to economic and military activities. To extend the cooperative process into the political arena invites loss of European sovereignty to a Trilateral global society. Traditional French hostility towards American political moves is not altogether without foundation.

So with this in mind, the coauthors feel it is important to take a look at European Trilaterals and their links to EEC and "One Europe."

THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The European Economic Community currently consists of ten countries: Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Greece. (Greece became an official member as of January I, 1981.) Spain and Portugal are tentatively slated to join the EEC in 1983.

BELGIUM

Out of ten Belgian Trilaterals, two are prominently connected with Europeanization and two more are connected with international banking.

Henri Simonet is foreign minister of Belgium and immediately before that (1973-1977) was vice president of the European Economic Community (EEC).

Jean Rey was Belgian minister for economic affairs from 1954-1958 followed by a long career at various European Community posts:

- 1958-1967, president of external relations of EEC

- 1967-1970, president of the executive committee of EEC

Two prominent Belgian Trilateral bankers include **Baron Leon Lambert**, president of Groupe Bruxelles Lambert, SA, which is affiliated with the Rothschilds, and **Luc Wauters**, chairman of Groupe Almanij-Kredietbank of Brussels.

DENMARK

There are three Danish Trilaterals. **Svend Auken** is Minister. of Labor and was a member of the Committee of Social Democrats *against* EEC to 1971-72. On the other hand, Trilateral **Ivar Norgaard** is Minister of Environment and was vice president of the European Parliament in 1974. **Norgaard** was a member of the Danish National Bank in 1968 but otherwise Danish Trilaterals are politicians rather than bankers.

EIRE (IRELAND)

There are seven Irish Trilaterals including prominent members of European organizations.

Michael O'Kennedy is the Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs and a former vice president of the Irish Council of the European Party in the senate. Another politician, **M.T.W. Robinson,** is a member of the executive committee of the European Movement. **F. Boland,** chairman of IBM-Ireland and a director of the Investment Bank of Ireland, is a former representative to the United Nations (1956-1964).

The key statement on "Political Cooperation" in the European Community was published by an Irish Trilateral **Garret FitzGerald,** former foreign minister of Ireland and current leader of the Fine Gael opposition party. He asserts that most European political activity is not part of the formal structure of EEC!

Political cooperation is centered in the office of the revolving post of president of the EEC Council of Ministers. A permanent secretariat of some 200 committees is constantly at work and meets on a continuing basis. **FitzGerald** is one-time president of the EEC Council of Ministers and claims that considerable political activity is taking place towards "One Europe." It is notable that according to **FitzGerald, Henry Kissinger** found Europeanization too complex to grasp: *it is a groping, slow movement toward a declaration of European identity.*

FitzGerald concluded:

> "*...the work of political cooperation is important because it is only through this pragmatic process of seeking on a piecemeal basis to harmonize foreign policy that that foundation can be laid for a European Community that can eventually develop into a genuine federation or confederation."*[2]

FRANCE

The French Trilateral component is not truly French but represents mainly the French connection to international and European organizations plus French banking interests.

Trilateralism is totally inconsistent with a deeply held sense of French nationalism. French Trilaterals are much further from the cultural soul of their country than perhaps any other Trilaterals.

The three French Trilateral-European Community links are of major significance. **Raymond Barre**, prime minister and Minister of France, was formerly vice president for Economic and Social Affairs at EEC. **G. Berthoin**, Trilateral European chairman, was the chief EEC representative to the United Kingdom, and was private secretary to the father of the One Europe concept - Jean Monnet. **Robert Marjolin** was formerly vice-president of the Commission of the European Communities and was a member of the International Advisory Committee of the Chase Manhattan Bank. **Marjolin** was for many years connected with the EEC and the organization of the OEEC, and with **Berthoin**, he forms the core link between French Trilateralism, the European Economic Community and **David Rockefeller**.

Why does France, the most independent nationalistic nation in Europe - almost the world - produce the strongest single Trilateral link to **David Rockefeller**? The answer might be that the Trilateral Executive Committee recognized the problem of French nationalism as standing in the way of One Europe and One World; perhaps special efforts were made to ensure a powerful French connection.

This French Trilateral triad is backed up by numerous lesser French Trilaterals with One Europe connections. They include **R. Bonety**, formerly with the EEC, **Paul Delouvrier**, formerly with the European Iron and Steel Commission, a part of EEC, and **Francois Duchene**, a French Trilateral residing in England as director of the Center for Contemporary European Studies at the University of Sussex. (This might be termed a European Trilateral think tank on a minor scale.)

Michel Gaudet was formerly director general of the EEC legal service. **Thierry De Montbrial** is director of the Institut Francais des Relations Internationales in Paris. This is the French affiliate to the Royal Institute of International Affairs with Trilateral connections through **Sir Andrew Shonfield**. Lastly, there is **Roger Seydoux**, formerly with UNESCO and UN.

Out of twenty-seven French Trilaterals we find that nine have strong One Europe connections.

WEST GERMANY

The West German team of twenty-one Trilaterals includes **Count Otto Lambsdorff**, the German Minister of Economics. In general, West German Trilaterals stress industrial and trade union connections rather than One Europe connections.

Trade unionists include **K. Hauenschild** (Chemical, Paper and Pottery Workers), **E. Loderer** (Metal Workers Union) and **H.O. Vetter** (Federation of Trade Unions).

Industrialists with U.S. connections include **Otto Wolff**, a director of EXXON and a member of the secret Bilderberger group.

Bank directors include **H.K. Jannott**, **A. Munchmeyer** and **N. Kloten**.

No German Trilaterals have more than incidental connections with One Europe. Even politician Trilaterals in Germany are domestically oriented, for example, **K.H. Narjes**, **H.J. Junghans** and **O. Sund**. The only major exception to this observation is **Karl Kaiser**, director of the Research Institute of the German Society for Foreign Policy and who is widely reported abroad and in West Germany.

ITALY

By contrast to West Germany, Italy has a major EEC and One Europe representation.

These Italian Trilaterals include:

- **F. Bobba**, in 1950, was with the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs with responsibility for European integration. Later, **Bobba** became director general of Economic and Financial Affairs at EEC.

- **Guido Carli** is a longtime member of the EEC Monetary Committee.
- **Umberto Colombo** is a director of the Committee for Scientific Policy at OECD.
- **G. Colonna Di Paliano** has been with a variety of European organizations since 1964, including EEC, ECSC and Euratom. He is also a director of EXXON.
- **E. Ortona** is a former president of the UN Security Council and a president of Honeywell Information Systems (Italia).
- **Giovanni Agnelli** is a key Trilateral, president of Fiat and on the International Advisory committee of Chase Manhattan (**Henry Kissinger** is chairman of the IAC).

LUXEMBOURG

Although an important member of the European Community, Luxembourg has no Trilateral members.

NETHERLANDS

With six Trilaterals, Netherlands has several connected with One Europe including:

- **M. Kohnstamm**, a civil servant with the ECSC in the 1950's and a vice-president of the Action Committee of the United States of Europe since 1956.
- **J. Loudon** is a member of the Atlantic Institute and Ford Foundation, a member of the Chase Manhattan International Advisory committee and chairman of Royal Dutch Shell.
- **E. Wellenstein** was with ECSC from 1953-1967 and director General of External Relations at EEC from 1973-1976.

UNITED KINGDOM

With twenty-six Trilateralists, Great Britain has several with a close connection to EEC Affairs. These include:

- **R.H. Grierson**, director general of Industrial and Technical Affairs at EEC in 1973-74.

- **R. Maudling**, with EEC in 1958-59.
- **C. O'Neill**, ambassador to EEC in 1963-66 and a director of the "Britain in Europe Campaign" 1974-75.
- **Lord Harlech**, chairman of the European Movement.
- **A.L. Williams**, deputy director of European Movement 1970-71.

In brief then, there is (a) except in the case of West Germany, a major connection between One Europe and Trilateralism, and (b) a rather deep connection between Chase Manhattan and the European side of Trilateralism.

HOW EUROPE SEES THE POLITICAL PROCESS

In some ways Europeans have a more sophisticated understanding of the realities of the world political process than many Americans. Yet in other ways Europeans are quite deficient in their understanding of the political workings of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Historically, Europe has usually been run by elites. Populism in the American tradition does not exist in Europe - it is more of a frontier phenomenon, in the Jefferson-Jackson tradition. Elites are known and hardly mysterious for Europeans. In Britain, for example, the word "establishment" is generally accepted, if not approved, and no one uses the label "paranoid" or "conspiratorialist" to an argument based on acceptance of an Establishment.

For many years in the United States any talk of "elites" or "establishment" put the speaker into the "kook" category. Europe doesn't have to be convinced of the existence of an elite; it is accepted.

From a European perspective, the distinction between Republican and Democrat has always been elusive. The major American parties are seen as merely different sides of the same coin, and the existence of a supra-party elite is quite acceptable.

So it is easier for Europeans to accept the concept of Trilateralism as a verifiable fact. Trilateral human rights policies are seen more clearly in Europe as a pragmatic diplomatic tool. Consequently Germany and France have been major supporters of South Africa, knowing full well that the US elitist attack on South Africa has been motivated by self-interest, not human rights.

Where Europe is weak is in its knowledge of the *details* of American elitism. While the concept is acceptable, knowledge of the details is vague, hazy and perhaps largely unknown.

EUROPEAN BLOCKAGES TO INFORMATION

Rather ironically though, Europe has greater blocks to details of US elitist operations than the United States. Governments own most of the radio and television industry this means censorship. A program on French radio or television exposing Trilateralism and its meaning for Europe is unthinkable; after all, an important part of the European elite is also Trilateral. French critics such as Pierre de Villamarest have a harder time disseminating information than critics in the United States.

Elitism in Europe is more securely entrenched than in the US. Both the US Constitution and American traditions frown on aristocracies and the flowering American aristocracy that stems from Alexander Hamilton.

ASPEN INSTITUTE BERLIN

The implementation of the concepts of secular humanism in Europe is being achieved through a branch of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Trilateralists and other elitists. (See Chapters Two and Three.) This is a major connection between European Trilateralism and American Trilateralism. In 1974, the Aspen Institute Berlin was founded as "an integral part of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies" and serves as the European and non-US funnel through which Trilateral ideas flow. In particular, the Aspen Institute Berlin states its purpose "as a flexible and experimental effort to articulate and to strengthen individual and social *adherence* to humanistic values."[3] (Emphasis added.) In other words, they are trying to force their values on Europe as well.

Members of the board of Aspen Institute Berlin include a host of Trilateralists, humanists, elitists and "One Europe" advocates: **Georges Berthoin** fits all those labels. Another board member is Marion Countess Donhoff, the publisher of *Die Zeit*, whose editor-in-chief is Trilateralist **Theo Sommer**, a participant in **Henry Kissinger**'s International Seminar in 1960. **Thierry De Montbrial** was at one time affiliated with the University of California at Berkeley and is the author of books on world economy and energy policy. **Richard Lowenthal**, a professor emeritus at the Free University of Berlin, has taught at elitist

schools like University of California at Berkeley, Columbia (where **Brzezinski** had planned to return in January, 1981), Harvard and Stanford, and is an expert on foreign policy, especially in regard to the Communist bloc.

Other non-Trilateral elitists on the board of Aspen-Berlin whom we wish to mention are: Robert McNamara, president, World Bank; Robert O. Anderson, chairman, Aspen Institute and Atlantic Richfield; Pehr Gyllenhammaer, president, Volvo; Conor Cruise O'Brien, editor-in-chief, *The Observer*, London; Jean-Francois Revel, editor, *L'Express*, Paris.

Additionally, we find the two most prominent German politicians of our time on the honorary board. First, there is Willy Brandt, former Federal Chancellor, chairman of the ruling Social Democratic Party and chairman of the United Nations' Independent Commission on International Development Issues (which included **Peter G. Peterson**, **Henry Kissinger** and *Washington Post* publisher Katherine Graham).

Secondly, there is Helmut Schmidt, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, a close friend of Valery Giscard d'Estaing.

Willy Brandt, in describing the reasoning for the Aspen Institute Berlin's location, gave away his own lack of understanding of the threat of the Communist bloc when he stated, "The choice of Berlin is not accidental - we regard it as a crossroads and touchstone of the new relationship between East and West." More recently, a publication of the Aspen Institute Berlin reported, "Scholars and public figures from the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe actively participate in the work of the Aspen Institute Berlin."[5] Once again, we view the Trilateralist's naiveté and self-serving attitude.

In sum, The Aspen Institute Berlin is a European mirror image of Trilateralist thought and practice.

ENDNOTES: CHAPTER NINE

1. Garret FitzGerald, *"Political- Cooperation: Towards a Common Policy"*, Commission of the European Communities, European September-October 1978, p. 18.

2. Ibid., p. 20.

3. *Aspen Institute of Berlin Catalogue.* p. 2.

4. Ibid., p. 2.

5. Ibid., p. 3.

EEC Foreign Community,

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

There is no doubt that the Trilateral Commission exists: it is not a figment of a wild imagination as some of its supporters claim. Further, this Commission has written policies and set objectives. During the Carter administration, members of the Commission had the majority of executive branch power under their control, and it doesn't look like much is changing under the new Reagan administration.

At this point, it is useful to address the criticism of the Trilateral Commission, and the counter-criticism from the Commission itself.

David Rockefeller's feelings about Trilateral critics have been amply demonstrated: he views himself as the "moderate middle," and puts his critics on the "far right." This same theme was used in the November 24, 1980 issue of *Forbes Magazine:* Washington Bureau Chief Jerry Flint titled his article *What's a Trilateral Commission?* and captioned it "Why Marxists and Birchers love to hate the Trilateral Commission."[1]

Flint stated,

> *"On the Right radical end of the political fringe, for example, is Patrick Wood, co-author of the book Trilaterals Over Washington - 53,000 sold, he says, who has a new expose coming and who publishes a monthly newsletter, The Trilateral Observer, from Scottsdale, Ariz. He warns that the Trilaterals want to trade America's economic independence for some kind of new, world economic order, a playground for the multinationals, manipulating governments for their profits.* "[2]

The article then talked about the John Birch Society (rightwing), Laurence Shoup (a Marxist writer) and *Penthouse* magazine. Flint interviewed Commission coordinator and member **George Franklin** who claimed "We haven't a single advocate of world government. . ."[3]

One of Flint's concluding thoughts was "Alas, people and their conspiracy theories are not easily parted. It is much easier to imagine a villain than to think things through."[4]

When this coauthor (Wood) was interviewed, Flint was pointedly told that neither Sutton nor Wood advocate, teach or believe in a "conspiracy" theory as such. This position has been expounded on

dozens of radio and TV shows all over America, and on numerous of prestigious speaking platforms.

A conspiracy is defined by Webster's as "a secret agreement to do something legal or illegal." Since the coauthors have had little trouble in acquiring information on Trilateral activities and positions, it can hardly be called a secret organization. Further, who has a right to act as judge and jury to determine legality or illegality of specific acts by members of the Trilateral Commission? (This requires a Congressional investigation into the facts presented in *Trilaterals Over Washington.)*

The Forbes article is significant for the following reasons:

- Flint ignored the reasons given for the coauthors' refusal to be involved with "conspiracy" tactics.
- He arbitrarily placed the authors in the "Right radical end of the political fringe," implied to be even to the right of the John Birch Society.
- He *did not mention* Professor Antony Sutton's name anywhere in the article, nor the fact that he was formerly a research fellow with Hoover Institution for War, Peace and Revolution at Stanford University - hardly the "Right radical end" of anything!
- Ignored was *The Nation's* recent article attacking the Trilateral Commission. *The Nation* is one of the most prestigious *liberal* publications in the country.[5]
- Also ignored was the suppressed criticism of the Commission by Nobel Laureate Professor George Wald in August 1980[6] - the reader may not agree with the criticism, but certainly cannot discount the source and the platform.[7]

The *Forbes* article typifies "establishment" handling of critics of the Commission. Responsible and researched criticism is "associated" with various minority radical elements in the country.

Since the truth of the matter (the facts) cannot be discredited, they attempt to discredit the critic. This is a shallow and weak ploy, not too difficult to see through.

To be fair though, some credit can be given the Commission in sending representatives to participate in public debates around the US with the coauthors. North American Secretary Charles Heck appeared

with Patrick Wood on the nationally broadcasted *Larry King Show* on the Mutual Broadcasting System, among others. Commissioners **George Franklin** and **Phillip Trezise** debated with Antony Sutton at different times. **George Franklin** has debated with left-wing Trilateral critic Howard Katz on an influential T.V. program in Florida.

It is the personal experience of the authors that when public response was measured (i.e., on "call-in" radio, T.V. shows or public speaking events), sentiment was at least 95% hostile to the position of the Trilateral Commission and only 5% against the position taken by the coauthors. While Commission members have no reason to admit it, overwhelming public antipathy against the Commission has stung deeply.

It has never been the coauthors' intent to unfairly discredit a person in contrast to the philosophy that person holds. People are people but ideas differ. When facts don't line up with a person's philosophy, and this discrepancy is pointed out, it is difficult for the person to resolve the discrepancy. The reaction will most likely be negative, ranging from ignoring the facts to lashing out at the person(s) delivering the facts.

The coauthors readily admit that a certain amount of their own bias shows in their writings, but this is only natural. Despite this, these works have been used by both conservative and liberal writers around the world. The reason is the coauthors' integrity for reporting facts is unquestioned, even if the reader disagrees with the conclusions offered.

As you have read this book, you may have arrived at different conclusions than the coauthors; in any case, you are probably antithetic to the Trilateral Commission and to the proposed *New Economic World Order*. You are urged to further your information gathering in your own community or sphere of influence. Share what you find with others, including the coauthors.

Freedom of the press is predicated on a free interchange of ideas and information. Any attempts to suppress either must be protested to the limit of moral restraint.

All in all, the information in this book (and in Volume I, as well) shows a very bleak picture of politics and the economics in the United States. Even so, it is a mistake to just abandon the field to the elite. God gave you a thinker (your brain) that is able to discern reality from fiction and fantasy; don't be swayed by psychological pressure designed to discredit what you think. Even if your thinking is *wrong*, if

you let someone browbeat you out of your position, you will still be wrong. Test every thing weigh, digest, chew, mull over, check, research, etc.

Then stand on *your* findings and decisions.

Finally, the coauthors believe that once the American in the street realizes the full implications of the Trilateral process, then Trilateralism will receive outright rejection. The reason is simple: Trilateralism is diametrically opposed to the US Constitution and will ultimately require removal of the Constitution if the New Economic World Order is to succeed.

ENDNOTES CHAPTER TEN

1. Jerry Flint, *What's a Trilateral Commission?,* Forbes (November 24, 1980), p. 45.

2. Ibid., p. 45. 3. Ibid., p. 46. 4. Ibid., p. 49.